

Volume XVII.]

November, 1840.

[Number 6.



THE  
*Daniel Murphy*  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, AS SET FORTH IN  
THE FORMULARIES OF THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES, AND  
WITNESSED FOR BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

---

EDITED BY C. WEBSTER,

Pastor of the First Associate Congregation, Philadelphia.

---

VOLUME XVII.

---

Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good  
way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.—Jer. vi. 16.

---

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM B. YOUNG,

178, RACE STREET.

---

1840-41.

POSTAGE: Two sheets, 100 miles, 3 cents; any greater distance, 5 cents.





THE  
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,  
AND  
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

NOVEMBER, 1840.

ART. I.—*Symbolical Language of Scripture.* No. IV.

THE *seasons* of the year are sometimes, though not often, employed as symbols. *Harvest* is most frequently mentioned, and as it naturally suggests to us, (1.) The results of former labours, (2.) A time of cutting down, and (3.) A time of gathering precious fruits, its meaning when used as a figure is corresponding, and readily determined by its connexion.

1. When connected with summer it has the first meaning, as Jer. viii. 20: "The harvest is past and the summer is ended, and we are not saved." That is, the whole season of opportunities has passed unimproved, and the time when we should have reaped the benefit of former diligence has of course produced us no good. 2. When it is considered as the time of cutting down, it signifies a season of judgment, as Joel iii. 13: "Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe." This is, as it were, the word of command to the executioners of divine wrath, to proceed and cut down these sinners, for the time of their judgment was come. Rev. xiv. 14, 15, 16, is the same figure with the very same meaning. The *vintage* may be considered as the same symbol; it occurs in connexion with the harvest in the two passages just named. Hosea vi. 11: "Also, O Judah, he hath set a harvest for thee."—That is, a time of judgment will come upon thee. 3. When the harvest is considered as a time of in-gathering, it signifies a time of great mercy by the bringing of many to God. Mat. ix. 37, 38: "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few," &c. That is, there are vast multitudes ready to be gathered into the gospel church by the ministry of the word, and very few as yet to preach it. 4. *Winter* occurs only once as a symbol, namely, Song ii. 11, already considered.

*The Sea* is frequently employed as a symbol, and may be considered either in its raging, confusion, and destructive power, or as to its depth and vast extent. In respect of the first, it signifies, 1. Many people in a state of war and tumult. We have this interpretation expressly given, Rev. xvii. 15. Accordingly, Jer. li. 4: "The sea is come up upon Babylon," signifies that the multitudes of raging enemies have overwhelmed her. (Though it has also a literal fulfilment.) Dan. vii. 3: "And four great beasts came up from the sea." That is, they rose among the nations, amidst the tumults of war. The same occurs, Rev. vii. 2. 2. The sea, considered as to its depth, means

that which is utterly lost, or that which cannot be found out. Mic. vii. 19: "Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." That is, freely pardon and remove them, so that they shall no more be found to stand against them. Ps. lxxvii. 19: "Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters." So awfully mysterious that we cannot fathom or find them out, as it follows in the next words of the psalm. Rev. viii. 8: "And as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea." It was not only overthrown, but so completely destroyed as to be lost for ever. I am aware, that this expression is generally interpreted somewhat differently; but to cast anything into the sea, undoubtedly is the total loss of it, as is plain in the passage last mentioned. And as the same figure is explained, Rev. xviii. 21, therefore it is most natural and easy to understand it so here. Rev. xxi. 1: "For the first heavens and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea." The sea here signifies the rage and tumults of conflicting nations, as it is opposed to the peace and happiness characterizing the period described. Rev. xv. 2: "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire, and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand upon the sea of glass, having the harps of God." The figure here is mainly in the description or properties of this sea; it is of glass, that is, pure and clear water, which together with fire are the chief agents in purifying and refining, denoting here the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, mingling with the severe afflictions of the faithful as the great means of their final and glorious victory. *Floods* has the same general meaning as the sea. Ps. xxix. 10: "The Lord sitteth upon the flood." Ps. xciii. 3, 4: "The floods have lifted up, O Lord, the floods lift up their voice, the floods lift up their waves. The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea." The meaning of both passages is plainly the same, namely: The Lord rules and overrules all the nations amidst all their confusions. 4. *Floods*, considered as to their overwhelming depth, signify affliction. Song viii. 7: "Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it." No variety, or amount of suffering can extinguish genuine love to Christ. Ps. xxxii. 6: "Surely in the floods of great waters, they shall not come nigh unto him." The greatest trouble cannot affect his standing in Christ. The same figure occurs, Ps. lxxix. 1, 2, 15.

*Rivers* naturally suggest to us, (1.) An abundance of water for drink or fertilizing the earth. (2.) Great and dangerous waters. (3.) Divisions of the land. As a symbol, it is most frequently taken under the first consideration. And (1.) When rivers are represented as fertilizing the earth, it signifies divine ordinances, and means of grace, Ps. xlv. 4: "There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God;" namely, the holy place, the holy ordinances of his house. Isa. xli. 18: "I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will plant in the wilderness the cedar," &c. That is, I will give abundance of ordinances to be enjoyed in all parts of the earth. Isa. xxxv. 7, is a figure of the same import. Ezek. xlvii. 6, 7: "Then he brought me, and caused me to return to the brink of the river. Now when I had returned, behold at the bank of the river, were very many trees, on the one side, and on the other," &c. Rev. xxii. 1: "And he showed me a pure river



of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb." Both figures and prophecies are the same, and denote the abundance of gospel ordinances in purity that shall be enjoyed at the time referred to.

2. When rivers or waters are considered as affording drink they signify the comfortable influences of the Holy Spirit; this idea is very frequently connected with the preceding. Isa. xliii. 20: "The beasts of the field shall honour me, the dragons and the owls: because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen." Isa. lv. 1: "Ho, every one that thirsteth! come ye to the waters." In both places the figure denotes not only ordinances, but also true spiritual enjoyment by means of them. Ps. cx. vii: "He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head." I am aware of the many criticisms that have been made on this brook, but it is plain that it is here considered as affording drink; and drink is comfort and refreshment: these, again, are spiritually from no other source than the Holy Spirit.

3. Rivers, considered as dangerous situations, signify much the same thing as flood or deep waters; namely, great and calamitous suffering. Isa. xliii. 2: "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee, through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee." Jer. xii. 5: "Then how wilt thou do in the swelling of Jordan." That is, in the greatest trials and dangers that are coming.

4. Rivers, considered as divisions or boundaries of land, signify the tribes or nations of these lands. Isai. viii. 7: "Now, therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many;" that is, as it immediately follows, "The king of Assyria and all his glory, and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks." Isai. xviii. 2: "—A nation meted out and trodden down, whose land the rivers have spoiled." Whose land the various nations have overrun, divided, and desolated.

*Waters, wells, and fountains.* Water in any situation may be considered, 1. As to its purifying property. 2. In a fountain or well as satisfying to thirst. 3. As flowing and continually extending. According to these ideas, we find its symbolical meaning.

1. When considered as purifying, it signifies the blood of Christ applied by the Holy Spirit. Ezek. xxxvi. 25: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean;" denoting the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit. Zech. xiii. 1: "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." That is, there shall be a full exhibition of Christ, in the perfect efficacy of his finished work.

2. A fountain or well, considered as affording drink, is of the same signification as rivers, before noticed, namely, the means of enjoyment: it has, however, a respect to the permanency of these means. John iv. 14: "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him, a well of" living "water, springing up into everlasting life." Our Lord here means the word of life, sent home to the heart by the Spirit. Isai. xii. 3: "Therefore, with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." That is, ye shall have great comfort and benefit, in waiting on ordinances. Rev. viii. 10, 11: "And there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it had been a lamp,

and it fell upon the third part of the rivers, and upon the fountains of water,—and many men died of the waters, because they were made bitter.” Signifying that at the time referred to, all ordinances would be so utterly poisoned with error in the Romish communion as to destroy instead of refreshing souls.

3. Waters or fountains, considered as flowing and extending, signify posterity, who proceed from parents like the various streams from a fountain. Num. xxiv. 7: “He shall pour the water out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters;” that is, he shall have a numerous posterity, who shall spread into many nations. Isa. xlviii. 1: A similar figure of the same import. Prov. v. 16: “Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad.” That is, let thy posterity be numerous. Deut. xxxiii. 28: “The fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine.” Ps. lxxviii. 26: “Bless the Lord, from the fountain of Israel.” In both of these passages the cause is put for the effect, the fountain for those who come of the fountain, that is, the posterity of Jacob.

4. To dry up a river or fountain, may be easily understood by the preceding remarks, namely, the diminishing or destroying of the power and prosperity of a people. Isai. xi. 15: “And the Lord shall utterly destroy the bay of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod.” Chap. xix. 5, 6: “And the water shall fail from the sea, and the river shall be wasted and dried up; and they shall turn the rivers far away, and the brooks of defence shall be emptied and dried up.”—Zech. x. 11: “And he shall pass through the sea with affliction, and shall smite the waves in the sea, and all the deeps of the river shall dry up.” These three places are one and the same prophecy, and the meaning of them all is given in the words that immediately follow; namely, “The pride of Assyria shall be brought down, and the sceptre of Egypt shall depart away.” Hosea xiii. 15: “His springs shall become dry, and his fountains shall be dried up.” That is, all his prosperity, whether it consist in riches, privileges, or children, shall cease. See also Rev. xvi. 12.

*Mountains, valleys, hills and high places.* These naturally suggest to us several ideas: 1. Mountains and hills are elevated and valleys are depressed more than the generality of country. 2. Mountains, &c. are remarkable for their greatness and strength. 3. They are generally most barren, and destitute of moisture. 4. All these objects form great hinderances, or difficulties to travel. Therefore,

1. Mountains, considered in respect to their height, signify a state of honour and prosperity. Ps. xxx. 7: “Lord, by thy favour thou hast made my mountain to stand strong.” That is, thou didst uphold me in a condition of prosperity and exaltation. Isai. ii. 14: “The day of the Lord shall be upon all the high mountains, and upon all the hills that are lifted up.”—The meaning follows, verse 17: “The loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of man shall be made low.” In this sense, however, the expression *high places* is more frequently used. Deut. xxxii. 13: “He made him ride on the high places of the earth.” That is, made him most eminent and honourable among the nations. Isa. lviii. 14, we have the same figure, with the same signification. 2 Sam. xxii. 34: “He setteth me upon my high places.” That is, in safety and honour.

2. A valley naturally signifies the opposite of a high place, namely, a state of humiliation. Ps. xxiii. 4: "Yea, though I walk in the valley of the shadow of death." Ps. lxxxiv. 6: "Who, passing through the valley of Baca." Baca, signifying *weeping*, both passages mean a state of deep distress and humiliation. Song vi. 11: "I went down into the garden of nuts to see the fruits of the valley." That is, the fruits of holiness, found most abundant in a state of humiliation.

3. Mountains and hills, considered as to their greatness and durability, signify kingdoms. Ps. lxxviii. 16: "Why leap ye, ye high hills?" the kingdoms of the world exult in their worldly greatness; "this is the hill which God desires to dwell in."—The church is the kingdom of Christ. Isai. ii. 2: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and exalted above the hills." The church and kingdom of Christ shall be established in the greatest honour in all the kingdoms of the world. Mic. iv. 1: The same, and Dan. ii. 35. Jer. li. 25: "Behold, I am against thee, O destroying mountain;" namely, the kingdom of Babylon. Rev. viii. 8, is the same.

4. Considered as to their barrenness, mountains and high places signify the most rude heathen nations. Ps. lxxii. 16: "There shall be a handful of corn in the earth, upon the top of the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon." The seed of the word shall take root and be abundantly fruitful even in the most rude parts of the earth. Isa. xli. 15: "I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys." That is, I will establish gospel ordinances in the most remote and savage lands, in the most unlikely places, and in all places.

5. Considered as hindering intercourse, mountains and valleys both signify all kinds of difficulties, dangers and enemies to the object desired. Zech. iv. 7: "Who art thou, O great mountain? before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain." That is, the great labour and complicated difficulties and opposition in rebuilding the city and temple should be completely overcome. Isai. xli. 15: "Thou shalt thresh the mountains, and beat them small, and shalt make the hills as chaff." Thou shalt come off more than conqueror over all opposition and enemies. Song ii. 8: "Behold he cometh leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills." Christ in the greatness of his love to his people comes at once over many things that might be hinderances to his holding communion with them. Isa. xl. 4: "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low," &c. Chap. xlix. 11: "I will make all my mountains a way, and my high places shall be exalted." These passages are the same prophecy, and signify the removal of every obstruction, and the opening of a plain and direct way for the accomplishment of God's good promise in its time.

6. For the mountains and hills to smoke, to melt, or to be overthrown, signifies the *effect* of God's power in subduing the difficulties of his people, or his wrath in destroying their enemies. Ps. civ. 32: "He toucheth the hills, and they smoke." Ps. cxliv. 5, to the same purpose; namely, the least stroke of his hand is sufficient to consume the greatness of worldly power. Isa. lxiv. 1. 2: "—That thou wouldst come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence." The meaning follows: "to make thy name known to

their adversaries, that the nations may tremble at thy presence." Jer. xxxi. 25: "Behold I am against thee, O destroying mountain—I will roll thee down from the rocks, and make thee a burnt mountain." The overthrow and utter desolation of Babylon, by the wrath of God, is here foretold.

ART. II.—*Plan of a School for preparing young Men to enter upon the Study of Theology in the Associate Church.*

[Although the following letter has not yet been laid before the presbyteries to which it is addressed, yet its public character seems to justify its insertion in the Monitor, especially as this will give the members of the Presbyteries of Albany and Philadelphia a better opportunity to examine the subject.]

To the Associate Presbytery of Philadelphia:

DEAR BRETHREN,—At a meeting of the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge, at Argyle, on the 4th inst. (Aug.) the subscriber was appointed to address you and solicit your co-operation in devising and carrying into effect a plan for establishing a school, or seminary, for the special purpose of preparing young men for the study of theology in our church.

The following Report of the committee appointed to draught a plan for carrying into effect the direction of the Synod at its late meeting in Baltimore, enjoining Presbyteries to take more efficient measures to aid and encourage young men of suitable qualifications, in preparing themselves for the work of the ministry, though not very particularly examined, was so far approved as to direct it to be laid before their sister Presbyteries of Philadelphia and Albany, and to request their views on the matters submitted as soon as practicable.

REPORT.—By a reference to the statistical tables published in the last minutes of synod, it is evident that the whole number of ministers in the Associate Church is by no means adequate to supply in a proper manner the congregations already organized. From that table it appears that there are at this time two hundred and twenty organized congregations under the care of the different presbyteries; and to supply these with divine ordinances, there are, as it appears from that table, only ninety-seven ministers. Of those who are included in that list, it is now known that five or six, by the operation of the necessary discipline of the church, have been suspended from the exercise of the office of the ministry. The services of two or three others, from age and other circumstances, can scarcely be considered available to the church: so that at present, even with the addition of six preachers from the student's roll this year, the whole ministerial force fit for service in the church does not exceed ninety, averaging nearly two and a half congregations to each minister. There must then be at least 130 congregations in the Associate Church in this country destitute of public ordinances every sabbath day. Besides, the minutes of synod for several years past show frequent earnest applications for supply of gospel ordinances from various quarters where there are as yet no organized congregations, and these applications have, in not a few instances, been altogether neglected for want of ministers and preachers to send. Indeed, all the supply which such places at any time get, is just so much more



withdrawn from the organized congregations. How, then, it may be asked, can the church under such circumstances extend her missionary operations. All that is done in the missionary field, must be taken from her own children, not now receiving more than one third of the spiritual provision they need and ought to have: it is obvious, then, that the first and main effort of the Associate Church should be to increase her ministerial force with pastors and teachers after God's own heart, to aid and encourage young men of approved piety and suitable gifts, and who understand, and with an honest heart love the principles of our public profession. There can be no question then, but that it is the pressing duty of the several Presbyteries to take the most efficient measures to carry into effect the design of the synod's directions. The present question is, How can it be most successfully done? In order to answer this question to advantage, it may be profitable to inquire briefly into the causes of this deficiency of ministerial help. The backwardness of the sons of the church to come to her help is no new complaint. "There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth, neither is there any to take her by the hand of all the sons that she hath brought up." (Isa. xl. 18.) It is to be feared that the want is not felt in a right manner, either by those who enjoy the stated dispensation of gospel ordinances, or by those who are destitute; and because the want is not felt, there is not sufficient earnest and believing pleading with God for pastors and teachers according to his heart; and those who engage in that work unsent, sooner or later prove a curse instead of a blessing to the church. All promised blessings must be sought from God in believing prayer: "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find." Our blessed Lord, in the days of his flesh, "was moved with compassion when he saw the destitute multitudes, because they fainted and were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd. Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few: pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he send labourers into his harvest." (Matt. ix. 38.) It is his will that his people should *ask* labourers from him; and because they do not *ask*, he does not send.

Another cause may be found in the negligence of the friends of Zion, in using the means necessary to aid and encourage suitable youths to devote themselves to preparation for the work of the ministry by acquiring the necessary education. As our Synod has remarked, "Heretofore this matter has been left to the choice of the youth themselves, to the inclination of parents and guardians, and to their private means of effecting their object." But some, for want of means, are discouraged from attempting to prepare themselves: too many parents, feeling but little concern about their own salvation, and consequently less about the salvation of others, would rather see their sons pursuing some more lucrative course of life, dissuade rather than encourage them to devote themselves to the work of the ministry. Others, again, who in youth feel sufficiently disposed to engage in that work, but meeting with no encouragement from others, and in addition to this, not having the control of means, their time passes on until they become so far advanced in life, as on that account to be discouraged. But there is still another, and probably a more serious difficulty than any of these, which pious parents (who prefer



Jerusalem above their chief joy) have to contend with, particularly in devoting their sons to study at that age which would be most suitable: and this is the difficulty of finding a proper place where they can intrust their sons at that tender age most suitable, without being exposed to many and powerful temptations, dangerous both to their moral habits and religious principles. This is particularly felt by many in the Associate Church, who would rather see their sons "faithful labourers" in the harvest field of the Lord, than most successfully laying up for themselves the most abundant riches of earthly productions; who would rather see them in the employment of the King of kings, as ambassadors for Jesus Christ, than occupying the throne of the most potent monarch on earth. It is a fact deeply to be lamented, that in most of the public literary institutions in our country, there is a great want of the right kind of attention to the religious instruction of youth; and it is almost impossible that in most of them it can be otherwise, as they are at present constituted. If the student pay an external regard to religion and religious institutions, most public seminaries attend no farther to his religious instruction, and in many it would not be desirable that they should. The youthful student is then left to the influence of his room-mates, or more intimate associates, to imbibe such particular sentiments as these may happen to entertain; and thus the hopes and fond expectations of many a pious parent have been blasted. If a temporary religious excitement gets up in our public schools, it is generally marked with wild and visionary features, often more fatal to the cultivation of true scriptural Christian principles than the most cold indifference. The religious instruction which the youth, and especially one who is training up for the ministry needs, is that of the parent who watches for the soul of his child as one who must give account of his trust, and who feels a true concern in the spiritual and eternal welfare of his child. The child who is rightly trained up in his religious education in the family, imbibes his sentiments, not so much from the instructions he receives in precepts and directions, as from the influence of the daily deportment and example of those with whom he associates. The child who is sent from under the parental roof, before his religious principles are thus formed, unless it be into another family where all his associates are under the continued influence of sound religious principles, is continually exposed to embrace whatever principles chance or circumstances may throw in his way. Parents, who are properly sensible of the actual danger to which they expose their sons, by sending them to most of the public schools, or colleges, will not venture upon it without a trembling fear for the consequences, until they see their principles fully formed and established.

But there is still another difficulty in the way, which every minister of the gospel who has turned his attention seriously to this subject must have felt, and that is the unsuitableness and defectiveness of the present course of study in most if not all our colleges, as a foundation for the study of theology. We would not complain so much of the *unsuitableness* of any branch of human knowledge, if such did not supersede and really displace those that are essential or highly important. It must be admitted that ethics, mental philosophy, philology and classical learning, which are essential, as a proper foundation for the study of theology, receive now a much less share of at-

tention than they did in some ages past, when truth was sought with more diligence, ardour, and scrutiny than at present.

If these observations be well founded, it must be obvious that the subject is one of deep importance, and should engage the attention of the church. Indeed, if it be admitted, as it universally is, that some preparatory education is necessary to the study of theology, why, it may be asked, should not the church provide for and superintend that preparatory education, as well as that she should provide for and superintend the studies of her students in theology. It is believed that observation and experience will prove that it is equally necessary and equally important in order to keep up a well supplied, sound, and thoroughly educated ministry.

The remedy, it is believed, will be found in the several presbyteries taking up the subject, and carrying into effect in the most efficient manner practicable, the directions of synod; and in most cases it is believed that this can be most successfully done by each presbytery, (or, where the presbyteries are so situated that two or three can unite,) establishing a school or seminary for the special object of preparing students for the study of theology. The church under the Old Testament had her schools for the sons; that is, the prophets. Under the New Testament dispensation, each of the apostles seems to have been attended by some who were preparing for the work of the ministry.

Before attempting to point out any plan for carrying into effect the object proposed, it may be proper to notice some of the objections, which are usually brought against the adoption of any public measures for supplying the church with ministers of the word. Some of these, at first sight, may appear not altogether without weight. It may be said, that to increase the facilities or diminish the difficulties of obtaining a suitable education for a gospel minister, may have a tendency to fill the church with an indolent, time-serving, or otherwise unworthy ministry. It is admitted, that no human care will be sufficient at all times to prevent hypocrites from entering the church, and even the ministry,—and the Head of the church sometimes permits such to enter the church for his own wise purposes; “for there must be also heresies among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest among you.” (1 Cor. ix. 19.) But the longer candidates for the ministry are under the inspection and supervision of the overseers of the church, will certainly not increase the facility of unworthy persons gaining admission into the ministry. Yet after all the care and vigilance that human prudence can exercise, it is to her omniscient Head that the church must look for faithful pastors: “Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.” (Psa. cxxvii. 1.) It is JEHOVAH alone that can give his church “pastors according to his own heart, to feed her with knowledge and understanding;” and he has expressly promised to do it. Hence it is that our Lord so strictly enjoined his disciples to “pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into his harvest.” (Mat. ix. 37.) And whatever it is the duty of the church to pray for, it is certain that she should use the ordinary means of obtaining.

But it may be farther objected, that the work of the gospel ministry is of such a nature that none ought to enter upon it who have not made it the object of their free and deliberate choice, and who do

not give reasonable evidence that they have been moved to make that choice by the Holy Spirit: therefore, to educate youths for that purpose before they have made that choice, or are capable of making it, is not the right way to provide the church with ministers. "It is better to wait till candidates come forward to offer themselves." The premises in this objection are admitted, but the conclusion is denied. None ever engaged in the gospel ministry from right motives, or with correct views, who are not deeply convinced that to promote the eternal salvation of sinners is a great and important work, highly glorifying to God; and none are ever truly convinced of this but by the Holy Spirit, who operates on the human mind by the instrumentality of means; and no means are more frequently blessed for leading the minds of youth to choose that which is good and acceptable in the sight of God, than early instruction and right education. Hence the proverb, "Train up a child in the way that he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." (Prov. xxii. 6.) Hannah's early devoting of the child Samuel to the ministry of God, in the service of the tabernacle, seems to have met with the approbation of God, and to have been attended with the most happy and blessed effects. Samuel's parents doubtless took all due pains by a suitable education to qualify him for the service for which he was intended, and we have no reason to doubt that the means used for this purpose were accompanied with much earnest prayer for the blessing, and their success. And why should not religious parents, pursuing a similar course, look still for similar results? The services of Samuel proved a great blessing to the church of God and mankind. The same thing might in a great measure be illustrated from the case of Timothy. He was instructed from infancy or childhood in the knowledge most suitable for the services to which he was afterwards called, and the happiest results were manifest. Let parents, let the church train up youths for the work of the ministry by taking a suitable care of their education; let them diligently seek the blessing of Zion's King upon their efforts, and soon shall the company of those who publish the gospel be great. It is only when we diligently use the appropriate means, that we can look for the divine blessing, and that we can confidently hope that our exertions will be crowned with success.

We think, then, it may safely be concluded, that no very serious or at least unanswerable objection can be brought against the public interference of the church with this subject, so important to the interests of the church and so loudly called for by the circumstances in which our Zion is at present placed.

To accomplish the object proposed, the following plan is respectfully suggested; namely,

1. That this Presbytery take measures to raise by subscription, donation, or otherwise, funds to establish on the cheapest and most economical plan practicable, an academy or high school, for the purpose of preparing for the study of theology young men to serve the church, either as stated pastors or missionaries, as the church may direct, and Providence open the door for them.

2. That the institution thus established be under the care and immediate superintendence of this Presbytery; or, if any other presbytery or presbyteries shall co-operate with it in accomplishing the object proposed, such presbytery or presbyteries shall have an equal participation in its management and oversight.

3. That the main object of this school shall be the education of young men for the gospel ministry, either as missionaries or fixed pastors, as their services may be most required: hence, the course of study to be pursued shall be such as will most directly tend to prepare them for the study of theology and their intended work.

4. That the presbytery or presbyteries shall provide the instructors, fix the course of study, shall judge when it is sufficiently completed, and shall also, at stated times, at least twice a year, diligently visit the school, hear the report of the instructors, and examine into the progress, the religious and moral deportment of the students, faithfully dealing with individuals as their case may require, and do all the duties of a board of trustees of said school.

5. That as soon as practicable a site shall be located for the school, convenient to a place of public worship in some one of the congregations of this presbytery, where economy, cheapness, and convenience can be best consulted.

6. In the whole management of the school, it shall be the design of the presbytery to make it attended with as little expense as possible consistent with the attainment of the end, and it shall also be the design of presbytery to extend, as far as practicable, assistance to such as need it, according to the directions of synod.

7. That students offering themselves with a view to prepare for the study of theology, and youths whose parents or guardians may wish to have them educated with this view, or others wishing to pursue any of the studies taught in said school, provided this latter class can be admitted without detriment to the interests of the former, shall be received as students.

It was resolved at the aforementioned meeting of this presbytery, to solicit the co-operation of the presbyteries of Philadelphia and Albany in establishing a school with the above design, on the plan here proposed, or the best plan that can be devised.

By order of Presbytery.

JAMES P. MILLER.

*Argyle, N. Y., August 11, 1840.*

#### ART. III.—*Crosses on Protestant Places of Worship.*

WHEN we change our position, the object at which we had been formerly looking will be found to present, to some extent, a different appearance. All are aware of this, but all do not seem to be aware of the change that may be produced in our minds, and the extent to which our moral sentiments may be affected, sometimes by simply changing the position of the same object. It is almost impossible to conceive the effect that would be produced on a Protestant congregation, were the cross that has long stood conspicuous on the outside of the church to be found some Sabbath morning placed on the top of the pulpit. In any one of the congregations, we venture to affirm, that more than one Janet Geddes would be found ready to hurl a stool, or some other instrument of destruction, at the idol; and in no long time, the Nehushtan would be pounded to atoms, or committed to the flames; while the person who had dared to transfer the obnoxious thing from the outside to the inside of the church, would require for his protection a better defence than the logic of the schoolmen,



or the liberal opinions of the moderns. Nor would the Cathari spend time in inquiring whether the thing that has so offended them underwent any change in its nature by changing its position. It is enough that it is now found in the inside of the church. On the top of the spire it was regarded with indifference—on the top of the pulpit it is viewed with intolerable aversion, and out it is thrown with becoming Christian indignation.

Now, were we standing by, we should say, this is right—this is a piece of church reform—out with it—smash it—burn it—it ought not to be there. Papists may call this impiety. High churchmen may sneer at it, and if they choose, call it the wicked fanaticism of Knox. While those who pretend to liberal views may hint, that a cross can do no more harm on the top of a pulpit than on the church spire. This may be true; but our question is, why should it be on either—what have Protestant churches to do with crosses? For is a cross not the same thing, to all intents and purposes, whether placed on the summit of a mountain or above the altar of a cathedral? The Papist thinks it the same sacred thing—a thing to be adored wherever it is seen. In this he is consistent. The views we hold are widely different from this; and our views are also consistent; for we regard it as a mere piece of wood, yet withal very mischievous; and even when gilded, or were it solid gold, we have no reverence for it, but hate the very sight of it wherever it is seen, but never so intensely as when we happen to see it in Protestant places of worship. Let it not be inferred that crosses are frequently seen on Presbyterian churches. Indeed, we do not know a single Presbyterian church in the province that has a cross on it. We wish we could say the same thing regarding all Presbyterian places of worship in other parts of the world. Yet we are not aware that the thing is very common with our denomination in any country. With the Episcopal church nothing is more common. And we perceive, in this province, the custom we are reprehending is obtaining countenance, or rather, we should say, is giving countenance to others from a very high quarter. We were truly grieved, when lately in the city, to see the splendid Episcopal cathedral desecrated by a flaming gilded cross placed on the top of the spire. We do not take upon us to say what the motives were of those who put up that cross. But we repeat, to us it would not be more offensive had it been placed in any part of the inside of the building. The thing is the same wherever it is placed. Protestants ought not to have crosses in their places of worship. Conventional authority is in all cases something, and in many cases it is much. Now, by conventional authority—and all the world knows this—the cross is the *sign of the beast*, the *armorial bearings* of Popish Rome. Surely all good protestants ought to avoid the *badge* of that corrupt and persecuting church. And this will be done by all who are sincere in the *grand protest* that has been made.

It is true, that those who are but partially Protestant in their heart will see but little harm, and possibly some good, in crosses. If they have leanings to Popery, they may find this a suitable way of expressing their affection. We do fear this, in many cases, is the true explanation of the matter. Without any reference to individuals, may we not suppose, that the cross on a Protestant church is used, not unfrequently, as a sort of telegraph by which a commu-



nication is delicately kept up with the old Lady of the Seven Hills. May she not in this way be informed, that although some of her children have departed far, very far from her maternal care, still they have not forgotten *all* the lessons she has taught them, and in good time may yet—return. This telegraphic power of the cross may do more than the simple are aware of. But the thing may work in another way. Suppose a poor ignorant Papist, who hardly knows any thing more of his religion than to make the sign of the cross, and who regards it with reverence when he sees it, such a man cannot but look with some degree of respect at Protestant places of worship on which the object is placed, and must surely look upon such Protestants as not very far from the *true faith*, and no very bad heretics, at least, not nearly so bad as those who have no crosses on their churches. How far this may tend to confirm the man in his errors, will depend upon circumstances which we do not stop to notice. This, however, seems plain, that it may afford no small consolation to the Papist, if he ever needs such consolation, that he is so much safer, who has the whole of the spiritual apparatus at his service, than those who have only a part. But then, in the eyes of many, it is a main part. Let those who choose, talk of the sister church of Rome, and put up the symbol of relationship—we repudiate both the language and the sign, and in this case the thing signified. Yet symbols tend more to union than the simple think. The clear-headed understand this. And this will be found especially true among those with whom symbols constitute nearly every thing, and abstract truth is regarded as next to nothing.

Still, it is said, Protestants do not put up crosses as Roman Catholics do, to adore them. We do not accuse them of this, and yet, the respect, or reverence paid to such things, has its degrees. The Papist reveres the cross in a high degree. Some Protestants we know have revered it in a low degree: both we regard as in error, although both are not chargeable with the same amount of error. We put the simple question, why put up a cross at all? The answer of the Papist is ready, and it has the advantage of being explicit. All know what it is. On the other hand, the Protestant talks of it, as a matter of taste, an ornament, a thing that can do no harm, and may do some good; and above all, that the Gothic order requires it. Gothic, indeed; if we may be allowed a pun on such a serious object. So, we doubt not, thought the Waldenses, when they beheld it blazoned on those banners which were waved by the faithful servants of the church, over many a ruined village and many a desolated valley. Truly the visible cross has been to millions the sign of more than Gothic barbarity. How often have superstition, fanaticism, and hypocrisy mustered their respective bands under it, and then led them on to deeds of unutterable ferocity! Now this is one reason, and a very sufficient reason it is, why we dislike to see the cross on Protestant churches. It has, as we have already said, been made the sign and badge of Popish Rome. Let her keep it. The sign is all she has. In her hands, to the world a dreadful sign. We have the thing signified. We need not a cross of wood to teach us the glories of redemption. It can teach nothing of salvation which we may not know as fully had we never seen it. The believing penitent thinks not of the cross of wood, but of the glorious personage who died upon it. What can a piece of wood tell of God's justice, truth, and

holiness? or of his law and its claims, and its penalty, of man's guilt and his impotency? or of the person of Christ, and his glorious work, and his ability and willingness to save sinners? These are the precious truths on which Paul had his eye when he gloried in the cross of Christ, and these are the truths which must be understood and embraced by all who, like him, shall glory in that cross. But what of these does a piece of wood teach or illustrate? Preposterous folly! "To the law and to the testimony," is the declaration of Protestants; and those who have gone to the "living oracles of God," for their knowledge of salvation. What can they learn, what do they need to learn on this matter, from a cross of wood? Those who do not possess information drawn from the word of God, cannot obtain a single thought, or a single holy feeling from any symbol or relic. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself," "this is my blood shed for the remission of sins," "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin," are but a few of a multitude of similar declarations which might be adduced; and we fear not to affirm, that any one of these, received by the authority of God, will do infinitely more to enlighten and console the mind than all the crosses in the world. Persons who make a show of wisdom or moderation by uttering truisms, may tell us that the best thing may be abused. We deny that a cross in the hand of a friar, or on the top of a spire, was ever a good thing. We ask, what good has it done, or can it do? It were indeed difficult to answer this. But it would not be difficult to show that it has done, and is still doing incalculable mischief. It is a grand instrument of superstition. This is enough to condemn it. Nor will it do to reply, that, according to our reasoning, all signs and symbols ought to be banished from the church, because they have been abused. We shall meet the objection here supposed, when once it is proved that the cross was appointed by God to the church as a sign or symbol. It is true it answered *one great* end, the Saviour died on it. But this end answered, the thing itself was to have no place among the symbols of religion. The brazen serpent put up by Moses, served an important purpose. That purpose accomplished, the value of the thing was at an end. But the Jews preserved it, and at length worshipped it. Many in the same way worship the cross. Yet we are told, the cross on churches may produce pious thoughts and divine emotions. A pile of grass may do this if the heart be right with God. But is it true that in those countries in which crosses every where meet the eye, the people are distinguished by piety and virtue? Is it so in Italy, or Spain? There, there is no want of crosses. The robber stabs you with a stiletto, the handle of which is embossed with the figure of a cross, and when he bends down to take your money, another cross suspended round his neck dangles in your face, and you are robbed amidst jingling of crosses and the sound of saints' names. It is indeed a thing that requires no proof, that in those Christian countries in which the traveller sees no cross he finds the *cross of Christ* best understood and revered.

Yet how often do we hear Protestants prate thus: A cross, if kept on the outside of a church, can do no harm and may do good. Then take it to the inside, and, that the amount of good may be increased, put an image upon it, and surround it with holy relics. Make the apparatus as complete as possible that the ignorant vulgar, (the phrase is a Popish phrase) who cannot think on any thing, may at least see something which may do good to their souls. This is the language (and the prac-

tice is in keeping with it) of the Romish priesthood. For certain very important ends, important to them, they have sunk the minds of men into the grossest ignorance, and have turned religion into show and fancy. Hence it is, that Popery has not only subverted Christianity, but has also seriously injured the human mind, speaking of mind in the language of the metaphysician. Within the circle which the priest draws, the intellect and the heart cannot enter. The senses and imagination, alone, find admission, and in the service of the Popish Church, they alone are called into exercise. This is placing human nature in a condition the most deplorable that can well be conceived; and this sufficiently accounts for the combination of superstition and fanaticism, which has been so often witnessed in the Church of Rome. Human beings thus in a sense deprived of intellect and heart, are in a fit state for being amused with the beggarly elements of monkish trumpery, such as crosses and relics.

In fact, the Protestant who conceives that such things can in any way be serviceable to religion, is in the worst sense more than half a Papist. And we venture to affirm, that the man who holds such views, only requires the spur of a motive (and not a very powerful touch) in order to make him pass into that church, which he has been taught to regard, from a similarity in certain symbols, as a sister communion. There is much in this, which not a few persons of the Protestant Church of England would require to ponder well; for it cannot be denied that not a few in that church occupy ground which will not be much longer tenable. Such Protestants as the Oxford divines, for example, and the followers of Laud in Canada, cannot much longer protest.

Still it will be said, why all this anxiety? A cross is but a part of Gothic architecture, or only a mere ornament. To this we reply, that a cross, as it simply strikes the eye, is certainly no ornament. Such, at least, is our taste in the matter, that we cannot regard it as adding any beauty to a building. But even were it an ornamental object, we should have serious objections against putting it up merely to adorn an edifice, just as we would object to many other things mentioned in Scripture, as having been closely connected with certain great events in religion, being employed to embellish life, or minister merely to taste. But, again, what shall be said when a cross is put on a building, the architecture of which in no sense requires it? The plain answer is, the thing is liked, and liked for other reasons than its being an ornament. There is more in these things, says the papist, than meets the eye: certainly there is to those who hanker after them. And when we hear the word *ornament* used as an apology for the practice we have been condemning, we are apt to suspect there is more in it than is intended to meet the ear of the uninitiated. Let it not be said, this is a groundless, and harsh surmise. Those who in any way make use of the peculiar instruments of superstition lay themselves open to even severer charges than are here made. The inspired writer makes a difference betwixt the image and the mark of the Beast. Some may not be chargeable with the former who are not altogether free from the latter, Rev. xv. 2. Alas, we fear that every Protestant denomination has less or more of this mark.

The Scottish reformers were in the right, when they declared, that truth was exposed to great danger while any of the things remained which had contributed so much to the growth of superstition.

These men of God entered the sanctuary with the word of God in their hand, and whatever they found there, that is found written in the sacred volume, they held sacred: upon them they laid no violent hands: but every thing found in the house of God, not found in the book of God, they cast to the moles and the bats. It was thus that the mass-books, holy vestments, crosses, and relics perished in Scotland. The reformation in that country was truly a Bible reformation, and therefore thorough. The consequences have been extremely beneficial. Before the reformation, Scotland was covered with thick darkness, and all ranks of the people were given up to the grossest vices, while the lower orders were exposed to constant oppression and the severest poverty. It is true, in our native land there is still much poverty and much vice. But take it all in all, where shall we find its like? What intelligence, what piety, what comfort and social order are there! The reformers—or rather we should say, the pure word of God in the hands of those men, formed the foundation, and gives beauty and stability to this delightful order of things. Scottish glory, as far as it is worthy of a thought, or feeling, is just Bible truth made visible.

It has long been the fashion, nevertheless, with sentimental tourists, infidels, papists, and high-churchmen, to speak of the Scottish reformers as mere savages; because in the accomplishment of their great work they destroyed crosses, statues, and altar-pieces, which, it is said, were exquisite specimens of the fine arts. And then we are referred to England, and told that nothing of the sort happened there. No. And the church of England is to this day but a half-reformed church. It requires an intimate acquaintance with human nature, as well as divine truth, and an extensive knowledge of the moral history of our race, to be able to form accurate conceptions of the extent to which truth may be corrupted by means of those things which were consigned to the flames during the reformation in our native land. Our Scottish reformers were not only pious men, but also in the fullest sense profound metaphysicians.

They fully understood the principle in theory to which we have referred. Its disastrous results they had the best opportunity of witnessing. Now suppose the extinction of crosses, paintings, and statues, how excellent soever as works of art, was essential to accomplish the reformation, who will say that these men did not act wisely in what they did? The things which they destroyed—(and the value of many of them has been grossly overrated)—had been long the instruments of superstition. Indeed it may with propriety be affirmed that superstition, in a great measure, leaned on them for its support. What were paintings and statues in the eyes of men who sought the glory of God and the good of souls? Were they destitute of all taste then? So it has often been affirmed. We do not believe it. We believe them to have been men of good taste and of exquisite sensibility. But they thought, and thought rightly, that better, if so it must be, that the finest works of art should be destroyed, than that one soul should be lost. They feared their God too much to trifle with his divine authority, and they loved the souls of men too ardently to put their eternal interests in competition for a moment with the mere matters of taste.—*Canadian Examiner*.



ART. IV.—*Letter from the Rev. Thomas S. Kendall, addressed to the Editor of the Religious Monitor.*

MR. EDITOR.—To correct misrepresentation, and to expose the bloody spirit of slavery, I deem it necessary to publish to the world an occurrence which took place a short time ago, in South Carolina.

You are aware that in June last I was appointed by the Associate Synod, then in session, to visit the churches under their inspection, in the bounds of the Carolina Presbytery; and there to officiate during three months, in preaching the gospel, and dispensing ordinances. Many interesting incidents occurred during my mission in Virginia, and North Carolina, which, for the sake of brevity, I pass unnoticed. On the second Sabbath of August last, I preached at the Associate Church, called Smyrna, in Chester district, South Carolina. Late in the afternoon, shortly before I had concluded my second discourse, the congregation suddenly gave signs of deep excitement, and much uneasiness. Shortly afterwards I saw, in that direction in which the attention of the congregation was turned, a considerable body of men approaching. They came up, looked in at the door and windows; some came in, and again went out of the house. It was easy to discover, from the fierceness and wrath depicted in their faces, and flashing from their fiery eyes, which had been reddened with wine and maddened with rage, that mischief of no ordinary kind was intended. After concluding my sermon, and dispensing the ordinance of baptism, I took out of my pocket "A letter addressed by the Associate Synod, to the congregations and people under their inspection in the bounds of the Presbytery of the Carolinas." This letter, which exhibits the Synod's sentiments on the subject of slavery, and which I had been in the habit of reading, and explaining, and enforcing at the end of the Sabbath's exercises, may be seen on the 29th, 30th, 31st and 32d pages of the June number of the Religious Monitor, for the year 1840. I proposed as usual to read it; but all was tumult, when Mr. W. Miller, a worthy elder of the Smyrna congregation, came up the stairs, and said that I had better not read the letter, as all was confusion, and these men were determined to take me away, and punish me. Being debarred from this privilege, I went on, at some length, to state my sentiments on the subject of slavery, the object of my mission, and the rights to which we as a church were entitled by the constitution of the United States, and the constitutions of the particular states, South Carolina not excepted. When I came out of the pulpit, Mr. Miller requested me to remain for some time in the meeting house, as it belonged to him, and they had no right to enter it. On hearing this, they rushed in; and, amidst a storm of unbridled passion, denounced me as an incendiary, an outlaw, as throwing firebrands among the slaves, to arouse them to butcher their masters. I denied all these charges, admitted that I had taught the doctrine contained in the Synod's letter, claimed the right of a citizen of the United States, repromanded their breach of the Sabbath, disturbance of public worship, and demanded their authority for what they were doing. If I had violated the laws of the state, I was perfectly willing to confront its tribunals, be tried by a jury of its citizens, and submit to its decisions. But without warrant, without authority, without right,



save that of might, my saddle-bags were seized, and myself violently taken out of the church.

After riding several miles in the midst of profane merriment, our Fairfield mob called a halt, paraded their men in a circle, examined the contents of my saddle-bags, item by item, took all my papers, and finally refused to return them. But here, as Providence had ordered it, they found nothing out of which they could decipher much. The Synod's letter was then read aloud, and the scene which followed beggars all description. Wrath, indescribable, settled in every face, curses of — old abolitionist, incendiary, devil, infamous wretch, cowskin him, hang him up, accompanied with fearful oaths, and imprecations, marked this transaction, which language utterly fails to describe. A darker scene of deep depravity, and awful impiety cannot be conceived. Assured that my life was now at stake, and yet convinced of the integrity of my purpose, and the justice of my cause, I rushed into the middle of the ring, with an appeal to their sense of honour, knowing this to be the only way by which such men can be reached. "Gentlemen, you will surely not condemn a man unheard. You have me in your power, resistance on my part would be worse than useless; but if you possess the high-minded honourable feelings which many of my southern friends possess, you are too magnanimous to condemn and execute me without permitting me to say at least a few words in my own defence." Several voices answered, "We want to hear nothing from a — abolitionist." One man, however, said "Boys, give him a chance, don't condemn him unheard." This truly was an animating voice. It was an intimation that God Almighty was presiding over the scene, and setting bounds to man's wrath. I was permitted to speak at some length, during which time my feeble powers were doubtless exerted to their extent, in vindicating the Synod's appointment, in sustaining their pastoral letter, in repelling the false charge of endeavouring to arouse the slaves to cut their masters' throats, in contending for the right of preaching the whole word of God, *every where*, and in claiming the privilege of a fair, and legal trial, as I had violated no law of South Carolina, or any other state. This seemed to have been the means of intimidating them, lest they might bring themselves into difficulty, so far that they desisted for the present from violence. But it was the last time they permitted me to speak for myself among them.

Night had now closed around us, a fit emblem of the scene of moral darkness that was being acted under covert of its deep shades. Fatigued by the labours of the day, and exhausted for want of food, I was hurried on twenty-two miles from the church, to the house of John Cockrell, eight miles north of Winnsborough, in Fairfield district. There I received some refreshment, and some time after midnight was safely lodged in a little back room, which was bolted and barred, and guarded through the night by sentinels at arms. Judging by the terrors of their own guilty consciences, they thought, perhaps, I would attempt to escape. But I felt too strongly armed in honesty, to dread such vile worms, and too strong a sense of justice in the cause of human liberty, to retreat from the place which God had assigned me. "I laid me down, and slept; I awaked, for the Lord sustained me."

The sun was rapidly ascending the heavens when I was aroused,

by the noise of unbolting my door, from a refreshing sleep. About the hour of eleven o'clock A. M. the petty little tyrants of Wateree came flocking in, great and small, master and overseer, from hill and dale, rivulet and brook, like so many vultures, thirsting for the blood of the victim. After long consultation among themselves, they introduced me to lawyer Woodard, of Winnsborough. It inspired me with fresh ardour to see the face of a lawyer; because I expected to meet a man of at least some reason and intelligence: as yet I had seen little else than a pack of infatuated, blinded, fierce, block-heads. The lawyer said he had examined the Synod's letter, and *although it contained one equivocal expression, yet it did not stand opposed to the laws of South Carolina.* This legal opinion is sustained by that of other distinguished individuals of North Carolina, who said that the Synod's letter contained no other sentiments than such as were held by many of the leading men of our nation—opinions which all republicans have a right to hold, and to publish.

Might it not have been expected after such a glorious triumph of principle among unprincipled men, after a verdict of not guilty had been returned by a jurist of their own choosing, that they would at least have set me free, and as gentlemen have apologized for their unchristian, ungentlemanly, mobocratic deeds already done? Instead of this, they hurried me away to a deep bottom, shaded with heavy timber, and secluded from the highway by a dense undergrowth; and there covered my upper regions with a coat of tar, overlaid with an abundance of feathers. Poor wretches! a sense of guilt disfigured their faces, for they looked like *men under the gallows*, and their hands *trembled like aspen leaves*, while perpetrating the infamous deed. Their number I supposed to be between thirty and forty, the names of some of them only I learned, and I wish them to be known throughout the length and breadth of Christendom. John Cockrell, John L. Young, Thomas M'Clintick, Dwight, Debousk, Bell, Sterling, the son of an old seceder, and, according to Murel's phraseology, their *striker*, Archibald Whyte, formerly a minister of the Associate church, now thrown overboard in disgrace. Whyte was not in company with these ruffians, but they showed me a letter bearing his own signature, which he had sent into that region, some time before I had gone down, in which he stated that I was to preach in Fairfield on the second Sabbath of August, was preaching doctrines contrary to the laws of South Carolina, and *ought to be stopped*; all of which were positive lies. This arch Judas had only a few days before invited me to make his house my home while I remained in that region. Enraged at the Associate Synod, for the unbending course of honesty which they had been pursuing, he endeavoured to vent his vengeance on their missionary. Poor man! he has drowned the voice of conscience amid the lashes of oppression, and has sunk himself from the high dignity of a minister of Jesus Christ to become the mere tool of haughty, petty tyrants, who now despise and curse him in their hearts. But is it so, as I have been informed, that he left his congregation in Baltimore, because they could no longer endure his drunkenness? Did one of his elders state to me the truth, when he said they had dealt with him at Steel Creek for drunkenness? Did a respectable minister of the gospel in Carolina inform me correctly, when he said that his drunkenness

was notorious, and many respectable citizens, not Whyte's enemies, but his friends, would vouch for the truth of it? The statements of such men I cannot doubt. Here is the source of this mischief, and here is the man that some honest but mistaken seceders are following, I fear, to their own destruction. Such persons I would solemnly entreat to pause, and reflect, and retrace their steps. Can you follow and justify such a reckless spirit? Can you associate with men who would encourage, or would act out such scenes of dark villany? Here too is a just picture of the bloody features of the infernal system of slavery. The question is not merely whether slavery is right or wrong, or whether men violate law or not, but whether the church of God, and all others who oppose slavery, shall, without law, be brought to such punishment as lawless men may choose to inflict? The arm of persecution is raised, and we must either submit to the haughty dictates of the infamous slaveholder, or be crushed by his power. Let the Christian, the philanthropist, the moralist, unite their energies, and this monster must wither beneath the scorching beams of light and truth; if not, it must still rear its giant form unawed, trampling our liberties in the dust, blighting our free institutions, and overspreading our happy land with moral pestilence and death.

T. S. KENDALL.

*Monroe County, E. T. September 7, 1840.*

---

ART. V.—*Reflections on 1 Thess. iv. 7.*

"God hath called us unto holiness."

Holiness consists in moral purity, or a moral nature conformable in some measure to the holiness of God, together with an outward deportment corresponding to the requirements of God's law. Of this kind of holiness comparatively few have any accurate knowledge; yet all confess the beauty and even necessity of some kind of holiness. Every man has some standard of right and wrong, by which he judges the conduct of others, and approves or condemns; though most men neglect to apply their standard to their own conduct. Consequently, nothing is more common than to hear persons condemn, in terms of unmeasured severity, in others, those things which they allow in themselves. "Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?" Rom. ii. 23. To this common foible of human nature may be traced much of the uncharitable censures and denunciations which men pronounce upon each other; and many of those calumnies, quarrels, and wars which afflict this guilty world. "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" James iv. 1.

If we take a survey of the political world, we behold hostile parties arrayed against each other in fierce and desperate conflict for power, with the weapons not of reason and argument, but mutual crimination and recrimination. And, in general, many of the hard things they say of each other are doubtless true. Both parties require integrity in their opponents: both disregard moral obligation in themselves.

If we look into the visible church, the prospect is but little im-

proved. Who can tell how much of the religious controversy, carried on in the world, may proceed from the same principle, which impels and nerves the mere politician? How much railing accusation is palmed off upon the church under the garb of zeal for holiness! How much greater ingenuity is displayed in attempting to fix a stigma upon the moral character of an opponent than to correct his errors! How much more easily can the great mass of the community be moved by an expert calumniator, than by the most conclusive arguments drawn from the inspired volume! Crafty men, perceiving this morbid disposition, are ever ready to contribute to its gratification, at the expense of all that is lovely and ennobling. The consequence of which is, the world is full of error, immorality, and spiritual death. The enjoyments of social intercourse are poisoned, friendships severed, the bonds of brotherhood rudely sundered, and those who are bound together by a joint profession of our common Christianity, a tie which should be indissoluble, are mutually exasperated to "bite and devour one another;" so that the earth itself, groaning under the guilt and pollution of its inhabitants, is daily disgorging its hundreds into the bottomless pit, that it may not sink under this intolerable burden of human depravity.

To deny these facts, would be to shut our eyes against the light. We may burn our bibles, demolish our churches, slay the ministers of religion, proclaim ourselves a world of atheists, or admit the appalling truth, that multitudes constantly throng the broad road to destruction—to endless perdition. But that we may escape this fearful doom, "God has called us unto holiness." Passing for the present the manner in which persons are called to holiness, it is only proposed to consider briefly, its *nature* and *necessity*. And,

I. Respecting the *nature* of holiness, the following observations are offered.

1. *It is a work of the Holy Spirit.* It is indeed ascribed to the Father and the Son. 1 Thess. v. 23: "The very God of peace *sanctify* you wholly." Tit. ii. 13, 14: "The great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all *iniquity*," &c. But it is the direct or immediate work of the Spirit. Or, it may be said, that our holiness proceeds from the Father, through the Son, and by the Spirit. That the holy Spirit is the author of holiness, is evident from the consideration that regeneration, which is initial holiness, is ascribed to him. Hence the Scriptures speak of the renovation and sanctification of the Spirit. It is through sanctification of the Spirit that we become God's obedient children, 1 Pet. i. 2. This holiness has many counterfeits in the world and in the church. An *unblemished deportment* is frequently relied upon as a passport to heaven. This is the rock on which moralists make shipwreck of faith. *Mortification of the body*, is another counterfeit most prevalent in former times among the Roman Catholics. An austere and rigid regard to the externals of religion, is another counterfeit which distinguished the Pharisees. But all these kinds of holiness lie within the scope of unsanctified nature; all have been attained by the heathen, and perhaps by the Stoics, who were bitter enemies of the true religion, Acts xvii. 18. But in the language of Scripture, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"

2. *As it is the work of the Holy Spirit, so it is an internal*



*work, carried on secretly in the soul.* "In the hidden part," says the psalmist, "thou shalt make me to know wisdom." "A new heart will I give you." It is true, that where this work is carried on, it will manifest itself by outward marks; yet it is difficult, and frequently impossible to distinguish these from the numerous counterfeits which are so exceedingly prevalent. Consequently, the necessity of charity and forbearance may be easily discovered. "Judge not, that ye be not judged." The world judges men by the amount of their professions, but God looks upon the heart. The world judges according to appearances, God judges righteous judgment. The carnal professor esteems that church most excellent, which exerts most influence in the world; but God regards only truth and holiness. Carnal professors connect the splendours of the world, with their forms of worship, but God seeks a spiritual worship. Carnal professors are most known to the world, because most ostentatious, but God's people are hidden, Ps. lxxxiii. 30.

3. *Holiness extends subjectively to the whole man.* The leaven which the woman hid in the meal leavened the whole lump. The understanding is spiritualized, so that the mind views spiritual things with spiritual eyes, in a way unknown to the highest possible degree of mere speculative knowledge. Accordingly, we find the apostle praying in behalf of the Ephesians, that "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, would give to them the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, that *the eyes of their understanding might be enlightened.*" Eph. i. 17, 18. The will is subdued to an obedience, at once voluntary and delightful. This submission of will extends both to the word and providence of God. And although absolute submission, from choice of the will, is not attainable in this world, yet it becomes predominant and habitual, so that the views, desires, and pursuits are regulated by the will of God. "I esteem all thy precepts to be right." "Blessed be the name of the Lord." The affections also accompany, or rather regulate the will. The choice of the soul proceeds from love. "The love of Christ constraineth us." "O how love I thy law!" Furthermore, the body is made a partaker of this blessed work. It is not indeed, strictly speaking, the subject of sin or holiness in itself considered; but, as it is united to the soul and the organ of its operations, it is subject to sin or holiness. Hence the members of the body are said to be instruments both of righteousness and unrighteousness. Accordingly, the apostle prays in behalf of the Thessalonians, that they might be sanctified "in body;" 1 Thess. v. 23. And the bodies of the saints are called "temples of the Holy Ghost;" 1 Cor. vi. 19.

4. *Holiness extends objectively to all the requirements of the moral law.* The holy person delights in the whole law, and would not desire a single precept blotted out, or neglected. Small duties are beautiful as they contribute to a perfect system. The Pharisees are no where condemned because they "tithed rue, and mint, and annise and cummin," but because they neglected the weightier matters of the law. "These things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the others undone." Many fatal mistakes are made on this point. How often do the best of men, occasionally at least, permit one duty to supersede another, and not unfrequently to supply the place of many others! The ministers of religion having



a burden of public duties connected with great care and anxiety, may neglect their own hearts. The cares of the world drive men from the closet, if not the public ordinances; and an outward respect for religion supplies the place of holiness. But gracious souls find no relief while a single unmortified lust exerts over them a controlling influence. If they offend in one point, they regard themselves as guilty of breaking the whole law, which gives them self-loathing views that are inexpressible. "O, that my ways were directed to keep thy statutes!" Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to *all* thy commandments."

5. *Holiness is a progressive work.* "Grow in grace." This of course supposes imperfection, not of kind, but of degree. The doctrine of "perfectionists," is not taught in the word of God; consequently those who imagine themselves perfect are not holy persons; and we may add, not Christians. For "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us:" 1 John i. 8. That perfection is required cannot be denied: Gen. xvii. 1. Matt. v. 48. This perfection will be ultimately attained in a glorified state, and then no room will be left for their growth "in grace." Consequently, a distinction between the requirements of the law, and the actual state of believers on earth must be observed. When the saints are said to be "perfect," as Noah, (Gen. vi. 9, Job i. 1,) uprightness, integrity, or sincerity, must be understood, according to the analogy of faith, and other portions of Scripture. Hence we find that Noah and Job sinned after it had been said of them that they were "perfect." But in the course of this progressive holiness, faith and repentance are made perfect, love burns with a purer and brighter flame, and patience has her perfect work.

6. As closely allied to the preceding observation, it should be remarked that *holiness is a permanent, abiding principle.* It is said of a holy person, "his seed remaineth in him." Again, "The anointing ye have received abideth in you." This characteristic of holiness should be observed with diligent attention, as it distinguishes true holiness from its several counterfeits. The carnal professor is now all life, anon all spiritual death; now all joy, anon all despondency; now his zeal overleaps all the bounds of moderation, anon he walks no more with Jesus. His penitence is regulated by earthly calamities; his joy by earthly enjoyments. His whole character is controlled by artificial stimulants, and his holiness quickly disappears like "the morning cloud and early dew." But how different the case of one born of God! "His seed remaineth in him." You may as easily arrest the planets in their course as divert such a one, for any considerable length of time, from his course towards heaven; which he regards as his home, and towards which he presses with all his faculties, in the diligent use of appointed means. He shakes off sloth, lays aside every weight, surmounts every obstacle, and avoids the company of profane persons, while all his delight is with the excellent of the earth.

7. *Holiness is necessarily accompanied with hatred of sin.* Sin being its opposite, is excluded. The same soul cannot love and cherish at the same time two principles so diametrically opposite. Consequently, the character given us of the saints, is, that they hate every false way. "Shouldst thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord?" "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil." "I hate

the work of them that turn aside." "I hate vain thoughts." "I hate and abhor lying." "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? yea, I hate them with a perfect hatred."

II. It was proposed to consider the *necessity* of holiness. And,

1. It is necessary in the nature of things, or rather *on account of the immaculate purity of the Divine Essence*. The holiness of God, is his beauty, excellency, glory; and his glory will he "not give to another." "Glorious in holiness." It is this perfection which imparts an ineffable lustre not only to the laws and government, but all the perfections of Jehovah. God is then by a necessity of nature a consuming fire to the unholy, for he cannot deny himself. Hence the exhortation "be ye holy, for I am holy." It is therefore manifest, that God can as soon cease to exist, as to cease the punishment of sin wherever it may be found. It must be punished when found only by imputation, in the person of his only and well beloved Son. In this view of the divine character, how delusive the hopes, how fearful the doom of unpardoned, impenitent sinners! O, that men would flee from the wrath to come, that they would learn, not to provoke one another to wrath, but to love and good works. For whatever may be the glosses put upon God's revealed will, by a guilty world, sin most certainly stands opposed to the being of God. Here, then, God and the sinner are perfectly at issue; totally at variance, at war. Can the result be doubtful? Hast thou an arm that is full of power like the Almighty?

2. Holiness is necessary *because it is commanded*. "God hath called us unto holiness." Has called, in his word and by his providence, all who hear the gospel, "unto holiness." In the case of his own people, to this outward call, has been superadded the effectual call of his Spirit. "He hath called you with a holy calling," says another apostle. And says Peter, "who hath called us to glory and virtue," that is, "holiness." This effectual call is simply the execution of an eternal purpose: Eph. i. 4. And therefore cannot be frustrated. We have no call to the indulgence of pride, envy, malice, revenge, uncleanness, or conformity to the world, but to "holiness." We may be tempted to the commission of sin in ten thousand ways, but we have no call from God to engage in the commission of any sin. "Be ye holy, for I am holy," is the command of our God, whose thunder shakes the heavens, and terrifies the earth. And will it not increase the everlasting suffering of impenitent sinners, dying under a gospel dispensation, that God once called them to holiness?

3. *Holiness is necessary to test the reality of faith, and consequently our title to the heavenly inheritance*. "You see," in the history of Abraham "how faith wrought by his works." Works are here put both for the *effect* and *instrument* of faith. Holy works were things produced by faith, by which it operated, and was made perfect, that is, demonstrated to be unfeigned. Forty years after Abraham believed, (compare Gen. xv. 6, with xxii. 12,) a remarkable act of self-denial and holy obedience is required in order to test the sincerity of his faith. To the same effect is the description every where given of the people of God. They are holy persons, they have the Spirit of God, and are led by that Spirit. If any man make a will, he describes the legatees; so our blessed Lord, for our comfort and support in this barren land, has described in his last

will and testament his legatees. They are holy persons, in possession of the Spirit of Christ, and led by his Spirit. How egregious the folly and presumption to claim under a will, while destitute of those characteristics by which the legatees are designated!

4. *Holiness is necessary for the right performance of duty.* "Unto them that are defiled is nothing pure." All their duties are sin. Every thing is defiled by their polluting touch. Do they pray? they receive no answer. Do they give alms? they receive no reward. Do they contribute to the support of the gospel? it is a polluted offering. Do they dedicate their offspring to God in baptism? they only lie to him with their false tongues. Do they partake of the holy supper? they only eat and drink judgment to themselves. Under the law, the man that was unclean and carried holy flesh, that is, flesh offered in sacrifice, was not purified, but the flesh was polluted: Hag. ii. 11, 14: so, if an unholy man engage now in the observance of holy ordinances, they do him no good, but he pollutes them; and this adds greatly to his stock of guilt. Fearful consideration, that men should aggravate their guilt and misery, by those things which God has mercifully provided for their salvation!

5. *Holiness is necessary for the enjoyment of heaven.* "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Impenitent sinners shall indeed see God as an enemy, but not as a friend. They shall behold the flaming sword of his justice, but not the bow of his mercy. They that are admitted into the gracious presence of God, and permitted to behold his face in peace, must be like him; and "we shall be like him." Therefore the righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance, because they are like God, while the name of the wicked shall rot, because they are not like him. This honour which awaits the righteous is from God. And as his majesty is above principalities and powers, thrones and dominions, so the honour which he confers infinitely transcends the swelling titles and glittering honours of this world. Here, the saints are made black in the eyes of the world, by persecution and affliction; buried in sad obscurity,—the drunkard's song, the scorn and contempt of "hypocritical mockers," and "worldly men, whose hearts are fat as grease." Paul was regarded as "the offscouring of the earth." That "light which is sown for the righteous," is concealed from common observation. The world hath not known it—the righteous scarcely perceive it. For there is a veil between us and the glory of heaven, which was typically shadowed forth by the veil that concealed the holy of holies from the view of ancient worshippers. In this arrangement we behold the wisdom of God. By it our faith is tried, we learn to rest on the naked promise of God without any discovery or sensible enjoyment of the things promised. Our love also goes forth to the embrace of an unseen Saviour, and our satisfaction becomes unspeakable and full of glory by mere anticipation. This wise arrangement is also admirably adapted to our present weak, imperfect state. Were the beams of future glory to descend upon us in their bright effulgence, we should be struck with blindness, like Paul at the appearing of Christ to him. That "eternal weight of glory" would overwhelm us. Our weak faculties, while in the flesh, cannot sustain the presence of God, who has declared that no man can see his face and live. But although it doth not yet ap-

pear what we shall be, yet are we the sons of God; we have been adopted into the family of Heaven, our names are inscribed on the records of eternity, we have already the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of future glory, the seal of God's love to us, while our full participation in the reward of the righteous is reserved to the unseen future. "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

In conclusion we may discover,—

1. *The great difficulty of being a real Christian.* It is nothing to talk of religion—to make a profession—to attend regularly upon outward ordinances, though many would be thought Christians who do not go even this length. But to be a holy person surpasses the power of nature; it is an attainment which belongs not to flesh and blood. And this need not surprise us if we consider the beauty and excellency of holiness. "It is nothing less," says one, "than entire submission to the will of God—a continual offering up of the soul in flames of love as a whole burnt-offering to Christ." Alas! how many are strangers to this great work upon the soul! But let not the righteous despair on account of the greatness and difficulty of this work. For notwithstanding the obstacles that lie in the way, and their own weakness and infirmity, they can adopt the language of the pious Newton—"I am not what I *ought* to be—I am not what I *wish* to be—I am not what I *hope* to be, yet I can truly say I am not what I *once was*—a slave to sin and Satan; and I can heartily join with the apostle, and acknowledge 'by the grace of God, I am what I am.'"

2. *Why so few persons are holy.* It is an attainment beyond their reach. This is evident from the whole tenor of scripture. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" The bodily eye cannot look upon the sun, it dazzles and blinds. Much more difficult is it for the eye of a carnal mind covered with the film of pollution, to look upon the Sun of righteousness. So that the holiness which ravishes the hearts of the righteous dazzles and blinds the world. "The rest were blinded." That which is not perceived can exert no influence over the mind. Consequently the unholy can have no holy affections, no spiritual joys. Again, as the rewards of holiness are future, while the objects of sense are present, so the latter easily obtain the preference. Present gratification is all they desire, all they seek; and the vanities of this world, in the judgment of a carnal soul, outweigh the most glorious futurity. And of all worldly persons, carnal professors are the most injurious to the growth of holiness among a Christian people, in a great variety of ways. They are a dead weight upon the energies of the church, and the most malignant and vindictive of persecutors. They slander that holiness to which they are strangers, and trample under their feet that humility and Christian meekness which they possess not. In their estimation, soundness in the faith is bigotry; Christian zeal, and faithfulness to our covenant God, fanaticism; warning the wicked man to flee from his wickedness, censoriousness. They wish for nothing but sweet promises made indiscriminately to the righteous and the wicked. To "hear of men's sins" is with them beyond all endurance.

3. *And last place, behold the excellency and blessedness of the saints!* Holiness is the most beautiful ornament that ever adorned



any of the creatures of God. In allusion to this holiness it is said, God will beautify the meek with salvation. The holiness of the church is her glory. "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." The believer's holiness is the connecting link, which binds him to the throne of God—secures the ministry of holy angels—the protecting power of the Almighty, and makes him an heir of glory. Nay, more, the believer's holiness ravishes the heart of Christ, and kindles his love into a most vehement flame. "Thou art beautiful, O my love, as Tirzah! How beautiful are thy feet with shoes, O prince's daughter!" Shoes denote holiness—"shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace," which is holiness. Blessed, yea, thrice blessed are these holy ones. They are in the possession of a treasure which shall survive the earth, the visible heavens, and every created object. They are dead to all that natural "love, and hatred, and envy," of which Solomon speaks. They live above the world. It cannot disappoint them, because they expect nothing from it. The flattery of the world cannot gratify them, because they know it is a lie. The envy of the world cannot terrify them, because they know it shall perish. Death cannot surprise them, because they daily look for it. It is enough for them to know that they shall soon be like Christ. Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen.

C. W.

ART. VI.—*Promiscuous or Indiscriminate Hearing.*

Mr. Editor—The subject of what is commonly called Occasional Hearing appears to be occupying to a considerable extent at present the attention of your correspondents. Besides occasional touches from others, no fewer than three appear to have engaged in the regular discussion of the subject—The ruling elder or R—Quero, and Pilgrim. This is in my opinion unquestionably a good sign of the present time. It may, however, be only an isolated oasis in the wide-spread dreary waste. It is always a good sign when people begin to inquire after truth.

At present it is not my design to interfere with the course of argument adopted by any of your correspondents already enlisted in the controversy, but as the subject is now before your readers, I think it reasonable to show also my opinion. The question as I understand it, is, what is the mind of God as revealed to us in his word on the subject? What does the Bible teach us respecting those whom we should hear as official and authoritative teachers of the religion of Jesus Christ? This is what should bind the conscience and influence the practice. The Bible teaches us to take heed *how* we hear. (Luke viii. 18,) and also to take heed *what* we hear, (Mark. iv. 24,) the subject of *hearing* then as a religious duty or act of worship is made matter of divine revelation. And if the Bible be a perfect rule of practice, which must be admitted, unless the inspiration of the scriptures be denied, it is a necessary sequence that it must also teach us *whom* we should hear. Let us then see what the Bible says respecting those whom we should hear. We shall attend first to the answer negatively.

1. We must not hear every one that may make pretensions to preach the gospel. Many men, and women too, have assumed to themselves the office of preaching the gospel. We must discrimi-

nate among those who profess to preach, if we must not hear all, we should not hear any who could not give some credible evidence that they have a right to preach to us. The church of Ephesus is commended because they tried those who said they were apostles, and were not, and found them liars, (Rev. ii. 2.) For the reason many undertake to preach who are unauthorized, the church is enjoined to try them. Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God, for many false prophets are gone out into the world. (John iv. 1.)

2. We should *not hear those who are not sent by Christ*. "How can they preach except they be sent? (Rom. x. 15.) They cannot preach as ambassadors of Christ, because he has not sent them as such. Among men an individual may not assume to himself the office of an ambassador. The government in whose name he would presume to act would not be bound by his own acts. It is so in the church of God: no man taketh this honour to himself, (Heb. iv. 5.) That is, it is not lawful for any man to do it. If this were lawful, or possible, self-sent men might frustrate the ordinance of God: for he *gave some* [not *all*] apostles, pastors, teachers, &c. (Eph. iv. 2, and 1 Cor. xii. 28.) Again, we may not hear *those who are not sent by Christ*; because it would be useless, such cannot profit those who do hear them, so says God's word. "I sent them not, nor commanded them, therefore they shall not profit this people at all," saith Jehovah, (Jer. xxiii. 32.) But it would be worse than useless to hear such,—it would be ruinous: it would be the means of causing the people to err, Jer. xxiii. 32, first clause; it would provoke God to forsake them, (ver. 33;); yea, it would provoke God to punish them, (ver. 34.) We conclude then, that it is the mind of God, taking the Bible as our rule, that we ought not to hear any who are not sent by Christ, [For a scriptural view of those who are sent, see R. Monitor, vol. xvi. No. 10.] To hear or attend on the ministrations of such would be contrary to the mind of God, a profanation of the ordinance of hearing the word, a useless spending of precious time, injurious to those we should hear, ruinous to ourselves, by provoking God's punitive anger. Let the reader carefully consult the above passages of scripture.

3. We ought not to hear those whose *instruction would tend to lead us into error*. "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge," (Prov. xix. 27.) This is an express command of God. Throughout the book of Proverbs, Christ, the personal wisdom of God, is the speaker. His design in that book is to show, how true and saving knowledge is to be obtained. See chap. i. 2, 7. And the directions to the attainment of this end are all practical and ought to be received by us as the rule of our practice, in the matters to which they refer. Now both the letter and Spirit of this direction, require us "*to cease to hear*" any person so soon as he begins to teach any doctrine or any practice, that would have a tendency to lead us away from that knowledge, the beginning of which is the fear of the LORD, (Prov. i. 7.) This knowledge is saving in its nature and tendency, while its opposite error, whether in doctrine or practice, is damning in its nature. It will be no excuse for the neglect of this command, that the person whom we hear was once sent of Christ, that it had once been lawful for us to hear him. Our text seems to refer to persons whom it was once lawful to hear: (it was once lawful to hear Judas Iscariot) this seems implied in the words, "*cease to hear.*" But the moment the person

begins to give instruction which causes to err, in the true spirit and meaning of our text, we are to cease to hear him, were he the apostle Paul, or an angel from heaven, (Gal. i. 8.)

4. We ought not to hear those who are offending against the unity of the church. The unity of the church is exceedingly precious in the sight of God. Christ died that he might gather together into one the children of God, that are scattered abroad, (John xi. 52, and Eph. i. 10.) To see the importance which the Holy Spirit attaches to the unity of the church, let the reader consult the following passages of God's word, Song vi. 9, where Christ asserts the unity of his church. "My dove, my undefiled, is but one," Jer. xxxii. 39: where unity is very specially promised. "I will give them one heart and one way," saith Jehovah. The same promise is repeated, Ezek. xi. 19; John xvii. 21, where Christ, in his last intercessory prayer on earth, before his crucifixion, prays for the unity of his church. The apostle Paul solemnly enjoins it, 1 Cor. i. 10; Rom. xv. 5, 6; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 2—6; Phil. ii. 2. On the day of Pentecost the church at Jerusalem enjoyed this unity, Acts iv. 32. "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul. And even much later, a very great degree of unity was attained to by the church in Great Britain and Ireland, when the standards of doctrine and practice agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines, which met at Westminster, on the 1st day of July, 1643, were ratified and adopted by the church, in those three kingdoms. Now to offend against the unity of the church, by teaching doctrines or pursuing a course of practice that tends to destroy or impair it, is manifestly a great sin, and grievous in the sight of God. Let us then see whether it is the mind of God, that we should hear such as do so, or not.

In Romans xvi. 17, we are enjoined by apostolical authority, to "mark them who cause divisions and offences in the church and to avoid them." Language, I think, cannot express more plainly or more unequivocally than this does, that it is the mind of the Holy Spirit that we ought not to hear such, because that would not be avoiding them—but the opposite—it would be following and cleaving to them. And as those who are causing divisions and scattering the church, are endeavouring to frustrate one great end of Christ's death, (John xi. 52,)—so we cannot hear them without disobeying the words and authority of God, besides making ourselves guilty of their sin, (2 John ver. 11.)

5. We ought not to hear those who are disobedient to the lawful authority of the church. That the church of Christ is invested with authority from Christ, her Lawgiver and Head, to exclude from the fellowship of the visible church, obstinate and impenitent offenders and transgressors, is evident from many passages of scripture, particularly Matt. xviii. 17, 18; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5. Or, she has authority to suspend or depose such from the office of the ministry. Such it would be unlawful to hear, because it is contrary to the mind of God revealed to us in his word. "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed," (2 Thess. iii. 14.) Surely, then, we could not hear such a person without manifestly violating both the letter and spirit of this passage of God's word, and also making ourselves guilty

of their sin, who refuse obedience both to the word and authority of Christ, exercised through his constituted organ. For Christ has expressly said that "where two or three are met together in his name, [as a court of his house, or judicially,] there he is in the midst of them," (Matt. xviii. 18, 20.)

6. We should not hear those who do not declare the whole counsel of God. The apostle Paul declared that he kept back nothing that was profitable to the Ephesians: that he shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God, and that it was thus that he kept himself pure from the blood of all men, (Acts xx. 20, 26, 27.) This is what is meant by preaching *faithfully*, and wherever *faithfulness* in preaching is wanting we can neither hear in safety nor yet lawfully. If any man should come and offer to preach to us, but did not give us sufficient evidence that he brought the doctrine of Christ, that is, the whole doctrine of Christ, we should not "receive him nor bid him "God speed," by countenancing him. This seems to be the divine rule, 2 John ver. 10; God's rule marks both ways. If it would be wrong for us to receive such a one, if he would come to us, it would certainly be as wrong for us to go to him, and we would as certainly involve ourselves in his sin; with this difference, in the latter case, that it would be more deliberate. Christ's commission to all *whom he sends*, is, to teach all his commands—"teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," (Matt. xxviii. 20.) If any man then neglect or refuse to teach *all the commands*, or the whole counsel of God, we cannot in safety to our own souls *hear him*.

I have now, Mr. Editor, specified six rules or directions concerning whom we should NOT HEAR; every one of them found in the word of God. And if, which is not the case, the subordinate standards of the Associate Church were silent on the subject, the Bible appears so plain, that "he that runs, may read." But the subordinate standards of the Associate Church recognise the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the supreme rule in practice, as well as faith. I think then there can be, or at least there need be no question, whether our standards are silent on the subject or not. And another thing also, I think, follows, as a necessary consequence, that every person who has been admitted to membership in the Associate Church, according to the act concerning the admission of church members, appended to the Testimony, or who has engaged, according to the formula of ordination vows, has given his assent to these principles. If any have not done so intelligently, it should be for a lamentation. These rules appear to me so plain and of so easy and general application, that I shall, for the present, rest the question on them. But if any of your correspondents should think them not scriptural or not found in the Bible, or if they should find any practical case, to which none of them are applicable, I hope they will point out the defect. It is thus truth is to be sought.

But before I close this communication, permit one remark more. Most persons whom I have heard vindicating the practice under consideration, seem to take it for granted that different denominations or divisions of professing Christians may lawfully or warrantably exist; and some of your late correspondents, though they do not expressly admit this idea, yet much of their reasoning seems founded on it. The question respecting promiscuous, or as more commonly but incorrectly called, occasional hearing, might easily and fairly be re-



solved into this: are different and opposing divisions of the Church of Christ warrantable, or right, according to the rule of God's word? This would indeed be the more legitimate form of the question. And if the affirmative of it could be proved, then might it be right to cause, countenance, and keep them up in all their abundance at the present day, by promiscuous or indiscriminate hearing of all, and all other means of favouring and encouraging them. But if the negative be the side that can be maintained in truth and righteousness, then it is right and an imperious duty on all Christians to discountenance and discourage them, by showing their disapprobation of them, by testifying against them, by all lawful endeavours to prevent their increase, by endeavouring to heal those already existing, by searching out and removing their causes, by pleading earnestly with God in prayer, that he would "give his people one heart and one way," according to his promise. Then would soon appear that glorious sight, "Zion's watchmen lifting up the voice, with the voice together singing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the LORD shall bring again Zion." (Isa. vii. 8.) Then shall it soon appear, "How good and how pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." (Ps. cxxxiii. 1.)

J. P. M.

#### ART. VII.—*The Book of Life.*

THE expression, "the Book of Life," occurs about eight times in the Holy Scriptures. There are a few passages where the phrase is to be found, in which, as a primary meaning, reference is made to the roll that contained an enumeration of the names of those who returned from the seventy years' captivity in Babylon. On this point, however, we do not dwell, but shall proceed directly to make a few remarks on the grand idea contained in the words—"the Book of Life." And it may be said, in general, that the very expression has something in it awfully sublime. Our minds are led from the transactions of mortal men, up to the all-wise and omnipotent God. In this expression, as in many others, the Spirit has been pleased to condescend to our weak and limited understandings; he has brought a subject of infinite importance down to the level of the meanest capacity; and has afforded a *stimulus* to excite hearers of the gospel to examine their evidences with greater carefulness, and to aspire with increased diligence after that holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Is there any heart so callous as not to tremble at the very thought of his name being excluded from the Book of Life? or rejoice so as not to beat insensibly when induced to believe, on good grounds, that his name has been therein recorded from eternity?

Although we are forbid, both by reason and scripture, to believe that there is in the courts of heaven, an actual roll in which the names of men and events are recorded, yet, we cannot fail to discover in the figure, much of the wisdom and love of God. The mind rests upon it with more ease than on an abstract truth; and although the one mode or the other equally conveys God's eternal purpose, with respect to the creatures of his hand, the expression, "elect, according to the foreknowledge of God," does not strike with equal force, as the language contained in Phil. iv. 3,—"whose names are in the Book of Life."

The general meaning of this latter expression, is *God's purpose of election*. "And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, (after

*the beast*) whose names are not written in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world." Rev. xvii. 8. There it is manifest, that all whose names are not in the Book shall be allowed to worship the beast; and, hence too it will be perceived, that the ultimate cause of distinction between one man and another, is his name being or not being in the Book of Life. Every good gift comes down from God. There can be no reason assigned why God chooses one part of a guilty race, and passes by the other portion of it. Why was it that the Lord made choice of Mount Zion as his dwelling-place? Was it, that it was the loftiest, the most fertile, or the most beauteous of all the hills of the promised land? No. But "the Lord *hath* chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest for ever; here will I dwell; for I have desired it." Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14.

The Book of Life is also called the *Lamb's Book of Life*. It is the Book of the Lamb, inasmuch as the elect were chosen in Christ, and given to him to be redeemed. The saints are not written in the Book of Life in the day of believing, because they have been written therein from the foundation of the world. Their names are not inscribed on account of any foreseen acts of obedience, for how could there be acts of obedience without the name being in the Book, when it is said with infallible certainty, that ALL shall worship the beast, whose names are not written in the Lamb's Book of Life from the foundation of the world?

But again, and that which we chiefly aim at; the names once written in the Book of Life, never can be erased from it. The purpose of God according to election *must* stand. No change can take place with regard to any of his designs, for he is without variableness or shadow of turning.

It is objected to this view of the subject, that God threatens to take away the part of certain characters out of "the Book of Life, and out of the holy city." (Rev. xxii. 19.) It might be sufficient to reply, that the meaning of these passages cannot be, that God will cast off any of his elect children, there being sufficient proof from other portions of scripture that such will not be the case. (See Ps. lxxxix. 30—33. But, it is not said that God will blot the name out of the Book of Life:—it is, "*God shall take away his part* out of the Book of Life." In Matt. xiii. 12, it is thus written—"for whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath." This is explained in Luke viii. 18. "And whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that he *seemeth* to have." So, here, God shall take away the part of that person who shall wilfully pervert and mutilate the word of truth; that is, he shall make manifest to angels and men, that such a one never had any part in the Book of Life, nor in the holy city.

But some one may say—we are taking too much freedom with the passage under consideration:—well then, let us examine it a little more minutely. It is clear we think, from the admission of all Christians, that no sincere follower of the Lamb could be guilty of such wicked conduct as that of taking away from the word and law of Jehovah. On the contrary, the law of the Lord is the delight of every saint; he meditates on it by day and by night, and it is sweeter to his taste than honey from the comb. Hence then, in the very nature of the case, such a judgment cannot, we repeat it—such an awful judgment cannot fall upon a sincere believer.

Lastly, it is said, "God shall take away his part out of the holy city." But is it possible for such a person as a corrupter of the word of God, to have any part in the holy city? No; for it is written—"There shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie." (Rev. xxi. 27.)

There is another passage, worthy of consideration, contained in Exodus xxxii. 32: "Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sins; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written." Be it remarked on this passage, that no argument against the perseverance of the saints can be adduced from it; because, in the first place, the words, "blot me out of thy book," constitute a part of the prayer of Moses, and not a declaration of God, with regard to him. Take what view of the book we please, God did not say, that he would blot out the name of his distinguished servant from its pages. Let us read the character of Moses, as given by the Spirit of God in Hebrews xi. 24—26. Could there be a more excellent character given to any mere man? He was a believer;—"by faith Moses:" he was remarkably self-denied; "he refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;"—he was willing to endure affliction; "choosing rather to suffer affliction:" he was also the meekest of men, and after his death he was buried by the hand of the Almighty, while his soul ascended to glory. And Moses was one of those who appeared with our Lord on the mount of transfiguration. Moses, therefore, was not lost, was not cast into hell:—but what is the character of those who shall be cast into that place of torment? "And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life, was cast into the lake of fire." (Rev. xx. 15.) Moses' name, therefore, was written, in the Book of Life, even before the foundation of the world, and hence too it is clear to a demonstration, that his name, or rather himself, could not be blotted out of God's Book in the sense supposed by the objector.

But some one may say, that Moses was desirous of having his name blotted out of God's Book, in the highest sense of the expression. Well, granting for a moment, that such was his intention, might not Moses, like Job, have uttered words rashly with his lips? But we would ask in few terms, how could that man be an Arminian, who, by the inspiration of God's Spirit, uttered that sublime sentiment contained in Deut. vii. 7, 8? "The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: but because the Lord loved you, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, from the hand of Pharaoh King of Egypt." What then was the book mentioned in the prayer of Moses, and again repeated in the answer of God? The cause of Moses' grief, and God's displeasure was that Aaron, at the instigation of the children of Israel, had made a golden calf. Moses was ashamed of the conduct of his brother, and of all the Israelites; he was indignant at their sin, and desired to be separated from the people, who so often grieved his meek spirit; or, perhaps he wished to be cut off, not only from the commonwealth of Israel, but even from the land of the living. Almost all who study the Bible are aware, that in the Old Testament, the terms "cutting off," and "blotting out," often signify excommunication from the society of the Israelitish church and commonwealth. The uncircumcised man-child was to be cut off from his people, and that soul, also, who should be guilty of eating leavened bread, from the first to the seventh day at the feast of the passover, was to be "cut off" in this sense of the

word. In Deut. ix. 14, the expression can only signify a blotting out from the land of the living: "Let me alone, that I may destroy them, and blot out their names from under heaven." Thus God did actually blot out a whole generation of stiff-necked Israelites, and caused their dead carcasses to be cast out and disregarded in the vast howling wilderness!

But even admitting that the book in the passage under consideration does mean "the Book of Life,"—yea, "the Lamb's Book of Life,"—what will the admission make for the objector? Does not God often speak in the language of men? Does he not speak of repenting and changing his purpose? Is it not said in Ezekiel that he who sinneth shall die? when it is not intended, that all who commit sin shall be cast into hell; but, that those who obstinately remain in sin shall suffer its awful consequences. So here, "whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book."—What is the meaning of this expression? One would almost imagine that Aaron was aimed at. Was Aaron a castaway? We have no such evidence. But did not all the children of Israel sin, as well as Aaron? and did they not sin on other occasions, as well as on the occasion of making the golden calf? And did not Adam, Abel, Enoch, Abraham, all sin? then must we conclude with the ruthless objector, that there is no Adam, the first of men, no believing Abel, no meek and humble Enoch, no faithful and self-denied Abraham, in the true bowers of Eden, in the heavenly paradise of God? Must we thus conclude, because men in their bold and determined audacity will deny that those whom the Father hath given to Christ, shall endure to the end? What kind of sin is it then, that causes God to blot names out of "the Book of Life?" It must be sin wilfully followed out, and eagerly persevered in till the end of life. But, those who are thus guilty have no part in the commonwealth of the Israel of God. The very assumption, however, that the Lamb's Book of Life, or in other words, the eternal purpose of God, is referred to in this passage, leads almost to blasphemy. It goes to say, that God did not know the character of those whom he recorded in his book at first, or knowing them, that he was not able to retain them; but afterwards having changed his opinion, or his power being defeated he was compelled to blot them out! The truth is, that Jehovah in this passage, speaks after the manner of men. The purport of this expression is, "he that sinneth shall die:" whether we view the punishment as excommunication from the church, temporal punishment, death, or eternal damnation; on which latter supposition our ideas must be restricted, according to the analogy of Scripture, to the fact of God's manifesting to angels and men, that those who shall experience such awful misery, never had any part in the Book of Life.

We cannot then accord with the supposition put forth by some writers, that Moses prayed to be cast off from God's presence for ever and ever. The supposition appears to us, to say the least of it, absurd. God's countenance is life, and his loving-kindness is better than life: and is it then to be supposed for one moment, that he who willingly forsook all the grandeur and royalty of Egypt, who chose affliction with the people of God, and who had respect to the *recompense of reward*, should, or could express a desire to be excluded from all participation in the glorious rewards that await the sons and daughters of God in the world to come?—*Belfast Covenant.*



ART. VIII.—*Engagement in Defence of the Liberties of the Church and People of Scotland.*

Whereas it is the bounden duty of those who are intrusted by the Lord Jesus with the ruling of his house, to have a supreme regard in all their actings to the glory of God the Father, the authority of his beloved Son, the only King in Zion, and the spiritual liberty and prosperity of the Church which he hath purchased with his own blood:

Whereas, also, it is their right and privilege, and is especially incumbent upon them, in trying times, as well for their own mutual encouragement and support, as for the greater assurance of the Church at large, to unite and bind themselves together, by a public profession of their principles, and a solemn pledge of adherence to the same, as in like circumstances our ancestors were wont to do:

And whereas, God, in his Providence, has been pleased to bring the Church of Scotland into a position of great difficulty and danger, in which, by acting according to the dictates of conscience and of the word of God, imminent hazard of most serious evils, personal as well as public, is incurred:

In these circumstances, it being above all things desirable that, in the face of all contrary declarations and representations, our determination to stand by one another, and by our principles, should be publicly avowed; and, by the most solemn sanctions and securities, before God and the country, confirmed and sealed:

We, the undersigned, ministers and elders, humbling ourselves under the mighty hand of our God, acknowledging his righteousness in all his ways, confessing our iniquities, and the iniquities of our fathers, mourning over the defections and short-comings which have most justly provoked his holy displeasure against this Church; adoring at the same time his long-suffering, patience, and tender mercy, and giving thanks for the undeserved grace and loving-kindness with which he has visited his people and revived his cause; under a deep sense of our own insufficiency, and relying on the countenance and blessing of the great God and our Saviour; do deliberately publish and declare our purpose and resolution to maintain in all our actings, and at all hazards to defend, those fundamental principles relative to the government of Christ's house, his Church on earth, for which the Church of Scotland is now called to contend; principles which we conscientiously believe to be founded on the word of God, recognised by the standards of that Church, essential to her integrity as a Church of Christ, and inherent in her constitution as the Established Church of this land.

The principles now referred to, as they have been repeatedly declared by this Church, are the two following, viz: 1. "That the Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate." 2. "That no minister shall be intruded into any parish contrary to the will of the congregation."

To these principles we declare our unalterable adherence; and confining them to the present position and the present duty of the Church, we think it right to state still more explicitly what we believe to be implied in them.

1. We regard the doctrine—"That the Lord Jesus is the only King and Head of his Church, and that he hath therein appointed a government, in the hand of church officers distinct from the civil magistrate"—this sacred and glorious doctrine we regard as a barrier in the Church of God against all encroachments and innovations inconsistent with the free exercise of all the spiritual functions which the Lord Jesus has devolved either upon its rulers or upon its ordinary members.—While, therefore, we abhor and renounce the Popish doctrine, that the government appointed by the Lord Jesus in his Church has jurisdiction over the civil magistrate in the exercise of his functions, or excludes his jurisdiction in any other matter, we strenuously assert that it is independent of the civil magistrate, and that it has a jurisdiction of its own in all ecclesiastical matters, with which the civil magistrate may not lawfully interfere, either to prevent or to obstruct its exercise.

2. In particular, we maintain, that all questions relating to the presentation and admission of ministers, or to the exercise of discipline and the infliction or removal of ecclesiastical censures, lie within the province of the Church's spiritual jurisdiction, and all such questions must be decided by the Church officers, in whose hands the government is appointed, according to the mind and will of Christ, revealed in his word, not according to the opinions or sanctions of any secular authority whatsoever. We are very far, indeed, from insisting that the judgments of the competent spiritual officers, in such questions, can of themselves carry out the consequences, or necessarily rule the determination of all those points that may arise out of them. In regard to these, and in regard to all temporal matters, we fully acknowledge the civil magistrate to be the sole and supreme judge—bound, indeed, to pay respect to the word of God, and the liberties of Christ's Church, yet always entitled to act independently, on his own conviction of what is right. But in regard to all spiritual consequences, and especially in regard to the spiritual standing of members of the Church, and their spiritual privileges and obligations, the judgments of the church officers are the only judgments which are recognised by us as competent and authoritative. And if ever the civil magistrate pronounce judgments by which it is lawful to control, or supersede, or impede the sentences of the church officers, in these spiritual matters, and in their spiritual functions and effects, we must feel ourselves compelled to exercise our own conscientious interpretation of the will of God in disregarding these judgments as invalid, and protesting against them as oppressive.

3. As the Lord Jesus has appointed a government in his church composed of church officers, so we believe at the same time that he has invested the ordinary members of his church with important civil privileges, and has called them to exercise, on their own responsibility, important spiritual functions. In particular, we are persuaded that their consent, either formally given, or inferred, from the absence of dissent, ought to be regarded by the church officers as an indispensable condition in forming the pastoral relation; and that the act of the congregation, agreeing either expressly or tacitly, or declining to receive any pastor proposed to them, ought to be free and voluntary, proceeding upon their own conscientious convictions, and not to be set aside by the church officers—the latter, however, al-

ways retaining inviolate their constitutional powers of government and superintendence over the people. We hold it, accordingly, to be contrary to the very nature of the pastoral relation, and the end of the pastoral office—altogether inconsistent with the usefulness of the church, and hostile to the success of the gospel ministry—an act of oppression on the part of whatever authority enforces it, and a cause of grievous and just offence to the people of God—that a minister should be settled in any congregation in opposition to the solemn dissent of the communicants. We deliberately pledge ourselves, therefore, to one another, and to the Church, that we will, by the help of God, continue to defend the people against the intrusion of unacceptable ministers, and that we will consent to no plan for adjusting the present difficulties of the Church, which does not afford the means of effectually securing to the members of every congregation a decisive voice in the forming of the pastoral tie.

4. And, farther, with reference to the question respecting civil establishments of religion, which we believe to be deeply and vitally concerned in the present contendings of the Church, we feel ourselves called upon to bear this testimony: that, holding sacred the principle of establishments, as sanctioned both by reason and by the word of God, recognising the obligation of civil rulers to support and endow the Church, and the lawfulness and expediency of the Church receiving countenance and assistance from the State, we at the same time hold no less strongly that the principles which we have laid down regarding the government of Christ's Church, and the standing of his people, cannot be surrendered or compromised for the sake of any temporal advantages, or any secular arrangements whatsoever; that it is both unwise and unrighteous in the civil magistrate to impose upon the Church any condition incompatible with these principles; and that no consideration of policy, and no alleged prospect of increased means of usefulness, can justify the Church in acceding to such a condition. We emphatically protest against the doctrine, that, in establishing the Church, the civil magistrate is entitled to impose any restrictions on the authority of her office-bearers or the liberties of her members. On the contrary, we strenuously assert, that it is his sacred duty, as it is his interest, to give positive encouragement and support to the Church in the exercise of all her spiritual functions—for thus only can God, from whom he receives his power, be fully glorified, or the prosperity and greatness of any people be effectually promoted. We admit, indeed, that, as supreme in all civil matters, the civil magistrate has always command over the temporalities bestowed upon the Church, and has power to withdraw them. But he does so under a serious responsibility. And, at all events, the Church, while protesting against the wrong, must be prepared to submit to their being withdrawn, rather than allow him to encroach upon that province which the Lord Jesus has marked out as sacred from his interference.

5. While we consider the Church's course of duty to be plain, if such an emergency as we have supposed should arise, we have hitherto believed, and notwithstanding the recent adverse decisions of the civil courts, we still believe, that the constitution of the Established Church of Scotland, as ratified by the State at the eras of the Revolution and the Union, when, after many long struggles, her

liberty was finally achieved, effectually secured that Church against this grievous evil. The only quarter from whence danger to her freedom ever could, since these eras, be reasonably apprehended, is the system of patronage; against which, when it was restored in 1711, the Church strenuously protested, and of which, as we have much satisfaction, especially after recent events, in reflecting, she has never approved. The restoration of that system we hold to have been a breach of the Revolutionary Settlement, and the Treaty of Union, contrary to the faith of nations. Even under it, indeed, we have maintained, and will contend to the uttermost, that the Constitution of the Church and country gives no warrant for the recent encroachments of the civil courts upon the ecclesiastical province: that in the terms of that constitution, the Church has still wholly in her hands the power of examination and admission, and, in the exercise of that power, is free to attach what weight she judges proper to any element whatever, that she feels it to be necessary to take into account as affecting the fitness of the presentee, or the expediency of his settlement; and that, unquestionably, in whatever way the Church may deal with the question of admission, the civil courts have no right to interfere, except as to the disposal of the temporalities. But while we have taken this ground, and will continue to maintain it to be lawful, constitutional and impregnable, even under the restored system of patronage, we avow our opposition to the system itself, as a root of evil in the Church which ought to be removed; the cause, in former times, of wide-spread spiritual desolation in the land, as well as of more than one secession of many godly men from the Church, and the source, in these our own days, of our present difficulties and embarrassments. We look upon the recent decisions of the civil courts as illustrating the real character of that system of patronage which they attempt so rigidly to enforce; making it clear, that it does impose a burden upon the Church and people of Scotland greatly more grievous than it was ever before believed to do. We consider it to be impossible for the Church, so long as this matter continues on its present footing, fully to vindicate or effectually to apply her inherent and fundamental principles; and it is now more than ever our firm persuasion, that the Church ought to be wholly delivered from the interference of any secular or worldly right at all, with her deliberations relative to the settlement of ministers. We declare, therefore, our determination to seek the removal of this yoke, which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear; believing that it was imposed in violation of a sacred national engagement, and that its removal will, more effectually than any other measure, clear the way for a satisfactory and permanent adjustment of all the questions and controversies in which we are now involved.

Having thus set forth the principles on which we are united, being deeply impressed with a sense of their sacredness and magnitude; having our minds filled with solemn awe as we contemplate the crisis to which God, in his holy providence, has brought this Church and kingdom; a crisis of immediate urgency and of momentous issues, in which great principles must be tested, and interests of vast extent may be affected; and desiring to deliberate and act with a single eye to the Divine glory, and a simple regard to the Divine will—



We, the undersigned ministers and elders, do solemnly, as in a holy covenant with God, and with one another, engage to stand by one another, and by the Church which God's own right hand has planted amongst us; promising and declaring, that, by the grace and help of Almighty God, we will adhere to the two great principles which we have avowed, and in all our actings as office-bearers in the Church, will do our utmost, at all hazards, to carry them into effect; and that we will consent to no surrender or compromise of the same, but will faithfully and zealously prosecute our endeavours to obtain a settlement of the present question in entire accordance therewith.

And considering, that, in this struggle in which the Church is engaged, it is most necessary that we should be assured of the concurrence and co-operation of the Christian people, on whose sympathy and prayers, we, in the discharge of our functions as rulers, greatly lean, and by whose influence and assistance we can best hope effectually to press upon the governors of this great nation the just claims of the Church—

We do, most earnestly and affectionately, invite our friends and brethren, members of the Church of our fathers, to come to our help, and to the help of the Lord; to declare their concurrence in the great principles for which we are called to contend, and their determination to do all in their power, in their station, and according to their means and opportunities, to aid us in maintaining and defending these principles; so that they, as well as we, shall consider themselves pledged to uphold the Church in her present struggle, and, in particular, to use the powers and privileges which, as the citizens of a free country, they have received from God, and for the exercise of which they are responsible to him, for this, above all other ends, that the determination of the Legislature of this great nation, whenever this subject shall come before them, may be in accordance with those principles, which all of us hold to be essential to the purity of the Church and the prosperity of the people.

We, in an especial manner, invite them to raise a united and solemn protest against the system of patronage, which, unjust and obnoxious as it was in its first enactment, the decisions of the civil courts are now riveting more firmly than ever on the reclaiming Church of their fathers. The entire removal of that system they have the fullest warrant, as Scotsmen, and as Presbyterians, to claim, on the ground of their ancient constitution, and the solemn guarantees by which their national freedom and their religious faith have been secured.

And finally, recognising the hand of God in our present troubles, depending wholly on his interposition for a happy issue out of them, and remembering what our fathers have told us—what work the Lord did in their days and in the times of old; we call upon the Christian people to unite with us in a solemn engagement to bear the case of our beloved Church upon our hearts, in prayer and supplication at the throne of God, beseeching him to turn the hearts of those who are against us, and to guide us in the right way, so that, under his overruling providence, and by the operation of his Almighty Spirit, the cause of truth and righteousness may be advanced, and the work of righteousness may be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever.

ART. IX.—*Church of Scotland.*

The Scotch Church is proceeding in her contest with the civil courts with a determination and vigour strongly characteristic of the national character, while there is also exhibited by her a moderation, and reluctance unnecessarily to proceed to extremities, which is probably justly to be traced to the high Christian principles which distinguish the able and good men by whom her steps are at present directed.

The Church has just taken an important step in advance. And we perceive that instead of the majority which carry her forward in her course becoming weaker, it waxes stronger and stronger. The majority in the Assembly which carried the motion of the Rev. Dr. Chalmers to stand fast by her statute privileges and to oppose Lord Aberdeen's Bill was eighty-four, while in the recent vote in the *commission* the majority was one hundred and fourteen: the numbers being 180 and 66. The opponents of the Church have been fond of tracing this ecclesiastical dispute to the *clerical* ambition of the Church. But it is a remarkable fact, that the number of lay elders in the majority exceeded the whole minority, lay and clerical put together. The numbers constituting the majority amounted, as stated above, to 180. Of this number 107 were clergymen, and 73 lay elders, and among the latter were the chief magistrates of the first two cities in Scotland: namely, the Lords Provost of Edinburgh and Glasgow.

Dr. Chalmers, in his splendid speech on the occasion, referred to the ground on which the Church was placed by statute law, ratified by the Act of Union in the following terms:—

"If ever a religious establishment in any nation was based, not on a tacit, but on an articulate and declared principle, it is that of the Church of Scotland, on the principle of her own separate and entire jurisdiction in things ecclesiastical. This is no fiction drawn up from the viewless depths of unknown antiquity, but the article of many a successive league—the watchword of many a persecuted congregation—the testimony of many a dying confessor, and which if he had recalled when brought to the stake or the scaffold, would have saved him from his martyrdom. It is not a thing which we have to conjure up or to fancy, but of which we read in the broad daylight of history. . . . . If ever Acts of Parliament can be illumined or interpreted by the events and the circumstances which gave them birth—then is the full recognition there of our spiritual independence made clear as with a sunbeam. But even of this light from without we stand in no need, when we have the light from within of our own Confession engrossed by the Legislature, and now made part and parcel of their Statute Book. There we read, not as *ordained*, but as *recognised* by the law of the land, that "the Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church officers, *distinct* from the civil magistrate." We now contend, not for any peculiar privilege, as an anomaly that belongs to our Church alone, and not to any other of the Protestant Churches in Christendom. Each will profess that there is a distinct government over things sacred; and though they may fix the line variously, each will zealously affirm that there is a line of demarcation somewhere between the civil and ecclesiastical—a department which the one claims as altogether its own, and on which the other may not enter."

This extract gives a glance to our readers of the statute privileges ceded to the Church; and that the majority of the Lords of the Court of Session are, under evil counsel, trampling on these privileges no unprejudiced man of ordinary understanding can by any possibility doubt. Indeed, we know it on the best authority, that Lord Aberdeen expressed great concern and regret at those proceedings of the Court of Session, in opposition to which the Church, in the persons of her most favoured and honoured sons, are now deliberately acting.

What are these operations of the Court of Session to which we refer?

The Church suspended from the exercise of the sacred office seven contumacious ministers. The Court of Session removed the suspension!

These clergymen being suspended from the sacred office by the authority which had imparted it to them, and, therefore, legally disqualified from entering the pulpit, or administering the sacraments, the general Assembly made provision, as in duty bound, for the administration of the bread of life to the people of those parishes during the suspension of their ministers, that suspension being imposed by the only authority that could suspend them from the exercise of the ministry. The court of Session *interdicted* any clergyman appointed by the Church for the fulfilment of those sacred duties, even from entering the parishes in question!!

Under these illegal and most unconstitutional proceedings of the civil court, the Church has acted with a spirit worthy of their forefathers. Seven of the most distinguished, honoured, and exemplary clergymen of the Church, among whom was the Rev. Dr. Gordon, proceeded, under the instructions of the Church, and in the face of this most disgraceful and unconstitutional interdict, to preach the Gospel and administer the other ordinances of Christianity in the parishes of the suspended ministers: and this duty continues, and will continue, to be regularly performed.

This, however, was not the subject which occupied the attention of the Commission. The Commission, our readers may remember, is a Court composed of all the members of the previous General Assembly; and the Commission met, under the instructions of the last Assembly, to take the preliminary steps for the *deposition* of the seven ministers, if they should continue to resist the authority of the Church, which they had solemnly engaged to respect and obey. They continued contumacious. And the charges against them, under the majority noted above, were regularly introduced, constituting what is technically called a libel, and under which unquestionably these erring men, who appear to us merely the tools in the hands of the virulent opponents of the Church, will ere long meet a most deserved doom.

This contest is unquestionably extremely to be lamented, and yet it has come forward in a manner unforeseen; and its prolongation, by whomsoever deplored, is far more lamented by Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Gordon, and the other leaders of the Church, who yet considered themselves conscientiously bound, under the most sacred obligations, to contend even to bonds and imprisonment, for the spiritual independence of their Church.

We perceived that the Lord Advocate of Scotland, in the House

of Commons, some time before the prorogation of Parliament, publicly repudiated the common saying of the opponents of the Church, that she was, in these matters, acting illegally. He, as well as Mr. Fox Maule, clearly distinguished between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions in Scotland; there are in that country clearly two concurrent authorities, and it is manifestly illegal in one of them to encroach on the province of the other. We have no doubt whatever, that the Court of Session is on this occasion the evil doer—the unjust assailant of rights not their own, and in truth the persecutors of the Church of Christ.

It is well to consider in this case, who constitute the majority in the Church which resists the civil courts, and who the minority who chime in with their oppressive proceedings.

Generally speaking, the approvers in the Church of the civil courts are the drones of the Church—the successors and representatives of the men who during the greater part of the last century kept her asleep; expelled from her bosom some of her most valuable members; originated and perfected the mass of the dissent which is now spread over the land; frowned upon missionary, and other similar operations, and were, in fact, men, for the most part, of the earth, earthy. It is the successors and representatives of these men who, generally speaking, are the approvers, or perhaps, rather the backers, of the Court of Session in their present proceedings.

And who are they who stand up for the spiritual independence of the Church, and resist with deliberate resolution the unjust encroachments of the civil power? They are your men of godliness and spirituality, of devotedness of heart and soul, and of the most abundant labours in the work of the ministry. They are the men, who the very first year after their emancipation from the night-mare pressure of their present opponents, began to build as many churches as the others had done in the previous century: this is a literal fact. They are the men who are now extending churches all over Scotland—dividing unwieldy parishes—sending forth missionaries to assist overburdened parish ministers, and labouring with vast energy and great success in the work of the Lord. They are the men who, not absorbed with their own immediate concerns, have engaged the Church in foreign missionary operations of various kinds, and are giving, in short, full proof of their ministry.

*Much fuller proof than comports with the worldly tastes and perceptions of a multitude of their most noted and virulent opponents!* We believe, if the true key is wanted which has opened, perhaps, the deepest and most determined opposition to the Church of Scotland in the Northern division of the island, it is to be found in the cause which we have now touched.—*London Patriot.*

---

#### ART. X.—*Reasons for the Perpetual Moral Obligation of the British Covenants.*

(Extracted from "Patrick Wellwood.")

ARE *promises* binding, whether personal or national? then are the Covenants binding, for they are national promises. Are *vows* binding? The Covenants are binding, for they are national vows. Are *oaths* binding? Did Joseph take an oath of the children of Is-



rael to carry his bones with them into the land of Canaan? Did the spies swear to preserve Rahab alive, and her house, in the siege and sacking of Jericho? Did Moses swear unto Caleb that he would give him a particular inheritance in the promised land? And were these oaths held to be of binding force, and as such observed? the national Covenants of Scotland are binding, for they are national oaths. Are *laws* binding? the Covenants are binding, for they are national laws, having been solemnly ratified by the Parliament, and registered among the fundamental laws of the kingdom. Are *contracts* binding? if a nation contracts a debt with another nation, or with individuals, is it bound by this contract till the debt is paid? and if the contract is broken, does it involve a breach of national honour and national faith? then are the Covenants binding, for they are national contracts,—contracts with the God of nations, in which this nation avows and avouches itself to be the Lord's, and promises to keep his statutes, promote his interests, and walk in his ways; all which, as a nation, it was bound to do so before by the law of God, but now by its own contract and covenant.

But though binding on them that subscribed and sware it, is the Covenant, you will ask, binding on us who did not? Is its obligation hereditary and descending? That it is so, appears from the following considerations:—

It was sworn by the *nation*. We form a part of the nation, therefore, it was sworn by us; it is binding on us, and will bind the nation so long as it exists.

It was sworn *for* us: hence that clause in the Covenant, “we, and our posterity after us.” In this respect it resembles the national covenant of the Israelites, at the taking of which Moses addressed the tribes in these words: “Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: that thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day; that he may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath; but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day: (for ye know how we have dwelt in the land of Egypt, and how we came through the nations which ye passed by: and ye have seen their abominations, and their idols, wood and stone, silver and gold, which were among them:) lest there should be among you man, or woman, or family, or tribe, whose heart turneth away this day from the Lord our God, to go and serve the gods of these nations; lest there should be among you a root that beareth gall and wormwood: and it come to pass, when he heareth the words of this curse, that he bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of mine heart, to add drunkenness to thirst: the Lord will not spare him; but then, the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the curses that are written in this book shall lie upon him, and the Lord shall blot out his name from under heaven.”

It was sworn for the good of the Kingdom; for the preservation of ourselves and our religion from utter ruin and destruction.

In its *form, end, and matter*, it is *moral*, and therefore binding. Could it be shown, indeed, that in any of these respects it was not *moral*, it would not be of binding force, either on those who subscribed it, or on us whom they represented, for we can neither bind, nor be bound to evil; but if this cannot be shown; if, on the other hand, as I have stated, it is in all respects moral, then so long as there is binding force in morality, in promises, in vows, in oaths, in contracts, personal or national—so long must we be bound by these great national deeds, which it was the glory of these lands to have entered into; but from which, to the astonishment of heaven and earth, they are now seeking to resile.

What applies to the National Covenant, with equal truth and force applies to the Solemn League and Covenant. That Presbytery is founded on, and agreeable to the Word of God, said he, I have taken some pains with you to prove. I may now add, that in Scotland, this form of church government is no novelty—that its existence was co-eval with the introduction of Christianity itself. The first who attempted to introduce prelacy was Palladius, who came to Scotland in the fifth century. The ministers of Christ were then simple presbyters or elders, none having rule over another, but each ruling his own flock—having been set over it by the laying on of the hands of the brethren united into a presbytery.

The model of prelacy which Palladius brought with him, the nation refused to receive—holding strenuously that the apostolic and primitive church admitted no subordination of ministers, and that ordination did not reside in one, but in all, who had perfect equality. When certain prelates came from Rome in this century, the presbyters of Scotland would not so much as admit them into their presence—for which they were censured by a synod of France, which, among other things, affirmed of our Scottish presbyters, that they “ordained elders and deacons without license of lords or superiors.”

In the ninth century, popery had established itself in substance and in form in England, which now sought to subjugate our church, as it had done to subjugate our nation. In a council held in this century, at Cealhythe, Scotsmen were forbidden to exercise any clerical ministry, “because they had no order of metropolitans, and because they gave not honour to others,” which shows that up to this period, there were none in the Scottish church who held higher rank than that of presbyter or bishop. The speech of a young minister, Gilbert Murray by name, in the council of Northampton, wherein attempts were made to impose prelacy on the Scottish church, has been preserved, and is of great worth and of singular beauty. “It is true,” said he, “English nation, thou mightest have been noble, and more noble than many other nations, if thou hadst not craftily turned the power of thy nobility, and the strength of thy fearful might into the presumption of tyranny, and thy knowledge of liberal science into the shifting glosses of sophistry; but thou disposest not thy purposes as if thou wert led by reason, but being puffed up with thy strong armies, and trusting in thy great wealth, thou attemptest, in thy lust of domineering, to bring under thy jurisdiction the neighbour provinces and nations, more noble,

I will not say in multitude or power, but in lineage and antiquity; unto whom, if thou wilt consider ancient records, thou shouldst rather have been humble, obedient, or, at least laying aside thy rancour, have reigned together in perpetual love. And now, with all wickedness of pride that thou showest, without any reason or law, but in thy ambitious power, thou seekest to oppress thy mother, the Church of Scotland, which from the beginning has been catholic and free, and which brought thee, when thou wast straying in the wilderness of heathenism, into the safeguard of the true faith and way unto life, even unto Christ Jesus, the anchor of eternal rest. She did wash thy kings, thy princes, and people in the laver of holy baptism; she taught thee the ten commandments of God, and instructed thee in moral duties: she did accept many of thy nobles, and others of meaner rank, when they were desirous to learn to read, and gladly gave them entertainment without price; books also to read, and instruction freely. And now, I pray, what recompense renderest thou unto her that hath bestowed so many benefits on thee? Is it bondage? Is it evil for good? It seemeth no other thing. Thou unkind vine, how art thou turned into bitterness; we looked for grapes, and thou bringest forth wild grapes; for judgment, and behold iniquity and a cry. But to the end that I weary not others with my words, albeit I have no charge to speak for the liberty of the Church of Scotland, and albeit all the clergy of Scotland would think otherwise, yet I dissent from subjecting her; and if it were needful for me to die in the cause, here I am, ready to lay down my neck unto the sword; nor do I think it expedient to advise any more with my lords the prelates, nor if they will do otherwise do I consent unto them."

The reply of King Alexander the Second to the pope's legate, when, in 1237, he desired leave to enter Scotland to redress, as he said, the affairs of the church, is also memorable: "I remember not," said the Scottish king, "that ever a legate was in my land; neither have I need of one, thanks be to God; neither was any in my father's time, nor in the times of my ancestors; neither will I suffer any, as long as I may." The independence of the Scottish Church was, it is true, at last destroyed. She who never bent her neck to Rome-pagan, bowed to Rome-papal. At the blessed and glorious era of the Reformation, this yoke was broken in pieces, and the church was once more settled after the ancient model, and became the same free Presbyterian Kirk, that, till the invasion of the papacy, it had always been. To preserve the Kirk thus modelled and thus settled, the National Covenant, as you already know, was renewed in 1638. While the National Covenant was renewed with this design in 1638, in 1643 with the same design—to countervail the treacherous and bloody plots and practices of the enemies of the reformed religion—to rear up a bastion on which the waves of popish rage might not only dash in vain, but dash themselves in pieces, and to bring the churches in the three kingdoms to a conformity, after the same primitive and apostolic pattern, according to the approved practice of these kingdoms, and the example of God's people in other countries, the Solemn League and Covenant was entered into, and sworn by the king, parliament, and people. This Covenant—for the equity of its matter, the formality of its manner,

and the importance of its object, equally lawful, and laudable, and binding with its National Covenant—has, as you are aware, in common with it, been lately rescinded, and is now not only derided and reviled, but the denial of its obligation is required as a test of loyalty, and a qualification for office. Though rescinded, however, on earth, it is registered, it is ratified in heaven—which has witnessed, and on king and people will yet punish this nefarious deed, which, however little thought of now, is, and in after ages, I doubt not, will come to be regarded and bewailed as a deep and deliberate PERJURY OF THE NATION'S SOUL. And I as little doubt but that the time will come when the principles contained in these rescinded Covenants, now hewn into a thousand pieces, and scattered with scorn to the winds, shall be gathered up with pious care, like “the torn body of a martyred saint.” Yea, when these Covenants themselves, now rescinded and reviled, as they were once Scotland's glory, shall become the means of her reformation and revival—a reformation more glorious than any she has yet seen. To contribute to such an end it were worth while to live, yea even to die.

---

ART. XI.—THE PLEA OF PRESBYTERY, *on behalf of the Ordination, Government, Discipline, and Worship of the Christian Church; as opposed to the Unscriptural Character and Claims of Prelacy; in a Reply to the Rev. Archibald Boyd, A. M., on Episcopacy.* By Ministers of the General Synod of Ulster. 12mo. pp. 612. William Collins, Glasgow; M'Comb, Belfast. 1840.

THIS second work of the ministers of Derry, in defence of Presbyterian Church Government, in reply to Boyd on Episcopacy, far excels its predecessor, “*Presbyterianism Defended*,” of which we have already spoken in terms of commendation. It is a very full and masterly production, and any notice which our limited space allows us to give of its contents, must convey a very inadequate idea of its excellence. The esteemed authors have approved themselves to be masters in Israel, in defending the bulwarks of our Presbyterian Zion. They have brought to the task an extent of research, a clearness and accuracy of discrimination, and a conclusiveness of reasoning which are rarely to be met with in modern controversial works. In acquaintance with the testimony of Scripture, and in the knowledge of the records of Christian antiquity, and of the writings of eminent Divines, both on the Episcopal and Presbyterian side, they have shown themselves more than a match for the champions of Prelacy, whether they are the followers of Pusey, or those in this country, who plead for the Divine right of Diocesan Episcopacy, and who would unchurch all that cannot find a Scriptural warrant for the whim of Apostolical Succession, or for self-invented ceremonies. The volume is, indeed, an arsenal of well-prepared arms for the defence of the Scriptural order of the Sanctuary; and it is worthy to be taken as a text-book by those who are to be intrusted with the defence of the battlements of the Church. The abettors of Episcopacy may evade the argument, or resort to the writings of the fourth or fifth century, when the mystery of iniquity had begun to work extensively in the church; or, make plausible appeals to a sentimental charity, which cannot distinguish be-



tween truth and error; but it will be long before they will fairly grapple with the statements and reasonings of the "*Plea of Presbytery*," and from the hands of its distinguished authors, they may calculate on certain defeat in their attempts to thrust upon the community the exclusive and intolerant claims of Prelacy.—*Belfast Cov.*

Could not the editor of the *Covenanter* transmit a copy of this work to us, by some person emigrating to America?—Edit. Mon.

#### ART. XII.—*Scripture elucidated.*

The Death of Shimei, 1 Kings, ii. 5—9.

The conduct of David in his expiring moments has been often branded by the enemies of the Bible as blood-thirsty and revengeful, and utterly at variance with that spirit of kindness and charity which religion enjoins and inspires; and not a few of the firm believers in revelation have felt themselves incapable of reconciling his charge to Solomon, respecting Shimei, with the principles of integrity, honour, and truth: "And, behold, thou hast with thee Shimei the son of Gera, a Benjamite of Bahurim, which cursed me with a grievous curse in the day when I went to Mahanaim: but he came down to meet me at Jordan, and I swore to him by the Lord, saying, I will not put thee to death with the sword. Now therefore hold him not guiltless; for thou art a wise man, and knowest what thou oughtest to do unto him; but his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood." The plain meaning of this, it has been said, is, "I swear that I would not put him to death; but be sure you do not let him escape;" thus, prevarication and blood-thirstiness reign in the breast of "the man after God's own heart," even on the eve of dissolution; and what is, if possible, still worse, the inspired narrative relates this charge, and records its execution with approbation.

Happily, however, the sacred text furnishes ample materials for rescuing, at once, the dying monarch, and that Spirit which spake by him, from the vile imputation.

It is not uncommon, as Dr. Kennicott long since remarked, and every Hebrew scholar knows, to omit the negative particle translated *not*, in the second part of a sentence, and consider it as *understood*, when it has been *expressed* in the first. Accordingly, our translators have often supplied the particle, though not expressed in the Hebrew, because the sense required it. Thus, Isa. xxiii. 4: "I travail *not*, and I bring *not* forth children, and I do *not* nourish young men, and I do *not* bring up virgins." The particle answering to *not*, is *not expressed* in the Hebrew, but *understood*, and rightly *supplied* by our translators, in the *last member* of the sentence. In Psalm i. 5: "Therefore the ungodly shall *not* stand in the judgment, and sinners in the congregation of the righteous;" the negative particle with the verb, "*SHALL NOT STAND*," must be supplied to complete the sense; thus: "And sinners shall not stand in the congregation of the righteous." Our translators have used the word *not* as equivalent to this. So in Psalm ix. 18. "For the needy shall *not* alway be forgotten; the expectation of the poor shall perish for ever." Our translators have necessarily *supplied*

the particle *NOT* in the second member of the sentence, though not *expressed* in the Hebrew, and have put it in *Italics*. And not to multiply examples, in Proverbs xxiv. 12, this is *twice* done. "Doth *not* he that pondereth the heart, consider it? And he that keepeth thy soul, doth *not* he know it? And shall he *not* render unto every man according to his works?" The negative particle rendered *not*, is *expressed* but *once* in the Hebrew in this passage, but is properly and necessarily supplied in the following members of the sentence. It would be easy to multiply instances, but it is unnecessary: see Judges v. 30. Job xxiii. 1, 7.—Psalms xxviii. 1, &c. &c. By supplying the negative particle, in the same way, in David's charge concerning Shimei, it will read, "But his hoar head bring thou *not* down to the grave with blood."

As the construction of the original requires this meaning, so it is supported by *the facts of the case*. Shimei had been an enemy to David; but he had made submission, and received the King's solemn oath that he should not be put to death. David therefore commands Solomon to keep the pledge sacred which had been given; but as he had been a troublesome man, and was a man of influence, he bids him "hold him not guiltless," that is, treat him not as an innocent person, who had never created disturbance, or evinced dissatisfaction with the government: "For thou art a wise man, and knowest what thou oughtest to do unto him," adds the King; as if he had said, You will easily find means to keep him from doing mischief, and yet preserve my oath inviolate.

Accordingly, Solomon acted upon this judicious advice. He did not suffer Shimei to go at large; he sent for him, commanded him to reside constantly in Jerusalem, and added, that if he should, on any account, cross the brook Kidron, it should be taken as an evidence of some seditious scheme, and he should die, and his blood be upon his own head. To these terms, as better than he deserved, Shimei gladly consented, and took an oath to observe them, as appears v. 43; but at the end of three years, he broke through them, and went to Gath. Upon this he was brought before the king; and while Solomon reminded him of his former wickedness, he pronounces sentence upon him; *not for that former wickedness*, but for *the violation of his solemn engagement*. See verses 36—46. All this shows that Solomon understood his father's commandment as above explained.

A comparison of the case of Shimei with that of Joab, *corroborates this view*. In the case of Joab, David recounts the murders of which he had been guilty; and on the ground of these, according to the command of God, directs Solomon to execute justice upon him, v. 5, 6. This Solomon does forthwith. But Shimei had *not* committed murder; and besides he had received the king's oath that he should be safe, as far as his past conduct was concerned; and had he not violated his own solemn compact, and Solomon's injunction, "his hoar head would *not* have descended to the grave with blood."

In all this David is to be considered, not as a *private man* giving advice to his children, but as a sovereign sustaining a public character, and giving a charge to his successor as to the due administration of justice.—*Dublin Christian Magazine*.

ot  
to  
th  
th  
to  
ed  
is  
he  
ne-  
ke.  
d's  
ng

is  
my  
g's  
ore  
en;  
ee,  
an  
ced  
an,  
ng;  
ing

did  
to  
any  
nce  
pon  
mei  
s v.  
ent  
So-  
en-  
cio-  
this  
ove

ates  
of  
g to  
im,  
om-  
he  
he  
ion,  
d."  
ing  
ter,  
n of

## CONTENTS.

	Page	Page
Sym. Lan. of Scripture, No. IV.....	341	The Book of Life..... 371
Plan of a school for Students.....	346	Defence of the Church of Scotland, . 376
Crosses on Protestant churches.....	351	Church of Scotland..... 381
Letter to the Editor.....	357	Perpetual obligation of the British
Reflections on 1st Thessa. iv. 7.....	369	Covenants..... 381
Promiscuous or Indiscriminate		Plan of Presbytery..... 381
Hearing.....	367	Scripture Elucidated..... 387

### RECEIPTS BY MAIL, FROM SEPTEMBER 26th, TO OCTOBER 17th.

J. R. Weldin, Pittsburgh.....	\$7 00	Hugh Arthur, (per R. George,) for	
John Foster of Schenectady, 16th		16th Vol.....	\$3 00
and 17th volume, and half of		John M'Call, (per Dr. B.) for 12th	
the 18th.....	5 00	and half of 13th volume.....	3 00

**BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.**—The New Book of Discipline is now ready for distribution. Price, twelve and a half cents single copy—\$1 25, per dozen—and \$3, per hundred copies.

### NOTICE.

It is proper to state that more than one half the subscribers to the sixteenth volume, have not yet paid. This circumstance, together with the unusually large amount due on preceding volumes, has left us nearly destitute of the means necessary for going on with the present. Believing that this remarkable deficiency is owing in a great measure to a deranged currency, and relying with confidence on the good faith of those who have already received the work, we have ventured to borrow a sum sufficient to meet present demands. From these facts, all will see, and especially agents, that some farther effort must be made, or we must ere long close the concern. We do not believe the church would be a gainer by the failure of a work which has been devoted faithfully to her interests, for sixteen years. The truth is, the subscription list ought to be, and might easily be doubled, did the proper spirit prevail.

We shall for the present print a number of surplus copies, in the hope that they will be taken.

All the preceding volumes are out of print.

**AGENTS.**—In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of good standing in the Associate Church, who are requested to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as special agents:

J. R. Weldin, 37 Market Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
 James Henry, Albany, N. Y.  
 Peter M'Arthur, Cambridge, Washington County, N. Y.  
 Alex. Gailley, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co. Pa.  
 Wm. M'Minn, Potter's Mills, Centre Co., Pa.  
 Thomas Beveridge, n. s., Canonsburgh, Pa.  
 James Gordon, Peoria, Livingston Co., N. Y.  
 John Anderson, Huntington, Pa.

Thomas Cummings, Putnam, Washington Co., N. Y.  
 James Wilson, Esq., Forks of Muddy Creek, York Co., Pa.  
 Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.  
 James Hutchinson, Esq., New London Cross Roads, Chester Co., Pa.  
 John Smith, Pittsburgh Village, Carroll Co., Indiana.  
 R. G. Shannon, P. M., Columbus, Randolph Co., Ill.  
 Col. Wm. M'Vay, Cherry Forks, Adams Co., Pa.

**TERRA.**—Two Dollars per annum, payable in advance or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

Post Masters are respectfully requested to notify us of any discontinuance of the work sent to their office. The numbers need not be returned.

No subscription discontinued till arrears are paid, unless at the option of the proprietors.

Money may be sent by mail at the risk and expense of the proprietors when five dollars or more is enclosed, provided the money is at par value in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, or Albany.